

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XVI. No. 21.] LONDON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1809. [Price 1s.

"The defect of Representation is the national disease; and, unless you apply a remedy directly to that disease, you must inevitably take the consequences with which it is pregnant. — *Without a Parliamentary Reform* the nation will be PLUNGED INTO NEW WARS; without a Parliamentary Reform you CANNOT BE SAFE AGAINST BAD MINISTERS, nor can good ministers be of use to you. No HONEST man can, according to the present system, continue minister."

Mr. Pitt's Speech; 1782.

769]

TO THE
INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

LETTER IV.

Parliamentary Reform.

GENTLEMEN,

My addresses to you, upon this subject, have for some months been discontinued on account of other matter having forced itself upon the public attention. Now we may resume the discussion without much danger of its being interrupted by the interest excited by warlike events, seeing that, after what we have now seen in that way, there can happen nothing of the sort, capable of exciting our wonder, or rousing our indignation. Since the date of my THIRD Letter; that is to say, within the short space of six months, we have seen, 1. The war and the peace, begun and concluded in Austria. 2. We have seen the campaign in the southern peninsula, the destructive campaign in Spain and Portugal, and the list of titles bestowed upon our commander. 3. We have seen the splendid and enormously expensive embassy to Spain. 4. We have seen the Walcheren Expedition, for the achievements of which, as well as for those of Baron Douro, the Park and Tower guns were fired, and government illuminations were made, in token of joy. 5. We have seen, one week, materials (even to brick and mortar) and workmen shipped off for the purpose of building barracks wherein to lodge our troops in the island of Walcheren, and, the next week, we have seen it stated, that these troops are ordered to evacuate the island. In short, six such months for military events; six months of such importance to the world have, I am pretty confident, never been before, though my opinion is, that the next six, after this winter, will not be less important. Well, Gentlemen, now, look back over these six last months, not forgetting that one of the ministers remained

[770

in office along with another of them, and suffered that other to plan and execute the terrible expedition to Walcheren, while the former carried in his pocket a promise of the dismissal of the latter, upon the ground of his unfitness for his office; not forgetting, I say, that millions of our taxes and the lives of thousands of our countrymen were committed to the united councils, to the co-operating wisdom, of men whose jealousy and hatred of each other urged them, at last, to shoot at each other's heads: look back over these six last months; then read my motto; and then ask yourselves, whether you have not there before you the *disease* and the *remedy*.

When Pitt uttered these words he did not foresee, that he himself should go so far in the way of fulfilling them. He could hardly have foreseen, that, "without a Reform," he should become minister, and "continue" such for nearly twenty years; had he foreseen this, he would not have declared, that, *without a reform, no honest man could continue minister*. We are now in a situation to render this subject particularly interesting, because we have the practical consequences before our eyes. A *change of ministry* is called for by some persons, as the means of saving the nation; or, at least, of affording it a chance of salvation; but, Pitt, in this memorable speech, told us, that, "without a Parliamentary Reform, *even good ministers would be of no use*," a truth which, I think, none but such persons as the Edinburgh Reviewers, that is to say, those who profit, or seek to profit, from corruption, will attempt to deny.

There cannot, I think, be the smallest doubt, that it is owing to the want of a representation of the people, that this nation has been plunged into new wars and expensive and useless and inglorious wars; for, indeed, it is manifest, that almost constant war is necessary to the present system, war being the source of such endless

means of influence. But, to take a recent instance or two, is it not notorious, that the war for Ferdinand VII, a war which has already cost us so many millions in taxes and so many thousands of valuable lives, a war the events of which make one shudder with horror; is it not notorious, that this war was never approved of by the people of this kingdom, who were willing to make any sacrifices for the purpose of restoring the liberties of Spain, and of defending them against Buonaparté, but who abhorred the idea of aiding in the perpetuating of Spanish bondage? The Edinburgh Reviewers have asserted, that the people have to thank themselves for the National Debt, for that they have always urged the government to make war: That every one of the wars of this reign has been a war of the people. "The people!" What a shame for men of talents thus to prostitute those talents! The people? In what way did the people express their approbation of this war for Ferdinand? I need not put the question to those of you, Gentlemen, who happen to live at Winchester, and who saw some two score of sycophantic clergymen and tax-gatherers and barrack-masters and dock-yard contractors trooping to St. John's House at the heels of George Rose, and there, calling themselves a county meeting, passing, in the form of an Address to the King, an approbation of the war just then resolved upon, and which Address was brought ready manufactured, in the pocket of the said George Rose, or some one acting under his direction. Now is it not baseness to the last degree for any well-informed man to call this the voice of the people of Hampshire? Our voice, as you well know, was directly against such a war; and, indeed, our interests must be eternally opposed to every project, calculated, as this was, to produce a waste of national resources, without the smallest chance of effecting any good purpose whatsoever. It is not so with the far greater part of those, who assemble upon such occasions. They have an interest not only separate from, but in direct opposition to, our interests. To them every addition to the taxes (no matter from what cause) is a benefit, because the gain of most of them is in proportion to the amount of the taxes. And, which applies to the whole of them, they, at any rate, have in view some place, pension, or emolument from the ministry of the day, and, therefore, they ought not to be, in such a case, considered as speaking the voice of the

people, nor, indeed, of any portion of the people.

It was my intention, at this time, merely to point out to you some of the consequences, which we have, at this moment, before us, of a want of a Parliamentary Reform; but, an advertisement, which I have just seen, for a county-meeting in BERKSHIRE "to consider of an Address, "congratulating his Majesty on his entering the 50th year of his reign," induces me to beg leave to trouble you with a few words upon that subject.—If there should be a meeting called in this county for a similar purpose, and if the Address, there proposed, should contain, whether expressly or by implication, any praise of the ministers and measures of this most unfortunate and calamitous reign, it will be our duty to demand an alteration in such Address. There is not a man of us who will be disposed to dissent from any expression of good wishes or of duty towards his Majesty; but, at the same time, that we "congratulate him upon his having entered on "the 50th year of his reign;" at the same time that we express our fidelity to him as our sovereign, it will be perfectly proper for us to express our unfeigned regret, that, during the whole of his reign, he has never had but very few servants, in whom the people confided, and that every set of his servants have been, by their successors, accused of want of honesty as well as want of wisdom; so that, each set of servants have made false assertions, or every set have been bad.—I trust, that we shall not keep away from this meeting (if one should take place) merely because it may be called by others. It is a time of the year when most men have some leisure. My decided opinion is, that it is impossible for George Rose and all his underlings to pack a meeting in such a way as to obtain any thing resembling a majority, unless they were to hire carts and waggons and actually bring up loads from the Dock-yards and the Barracks in the Isle of Wight. Indeed, they cannot do it: let the yeomanry act as they did upon the last occasion, and there is not the smallest doubt of their success.—This county has long been regarded as being full as much at the ministers' nod as if it were a rotten borough. It was only because it had lent itself to faction. Every man almost was persuaded to attach himself to one faction or the other, and thus became a political slave of his own accord. This is not now the case. We

Now think, each man of us for himself, and we have proved to the nation, that Hampshire is yet a little more dear to us than Hanover.—I beg leave to add one caution. The factions may, perhaps, agree to call together only the *Noblemen, Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders*. But, they have *no power of exclusion*. Every man, who can possibly attend, should attend, and no one dare attempt to set his voice aside. There are thousands of persons, who have copy-hold, or lease-hold, lands, or who have good personal property, though they have nothing of what is called *freehold*; but, will such persons be weak enough to keep away from a county-meeting upon that account, and thus tacitly sanction the abominable abuse, of which we complain, and which abuse sets a forty-shilling freeholder, who is not infrequently a *pauper*, above the copy or lease holder, or the man in trade, or the farmer, who is, perhaps, worth thousands of pounds, and who pays in taxes every year, or, perhaps three or four times a year, more than the fee-simple of the forty-shilling freeholder's property is worth.—No: I trust, that there are, at this day, very few indeed of the yeomanry and tradesmen of this county, who are to be thus deceived, or thus intimidated from doing their duty. Every man in the county has a right to attend a county meeting, and, for this reason, that no one has a right to put any question to him as to what is the nature of his property. Those who pay no taxes, indeed, if any such could be found, might, with some show of reason, be objected to. At a meeting, some time ago, at Reading, it was asked whether there were any but freeholders in the Hall; whereupon MR. ALLETT said: "If there be any man here who does not pay taxes, in one shape or another, let him withdraw." A laugh ensued, and all stood fast.—This is the principle whereon to act in such a case. There is no one who has authority to examine into any person's qualification. No one has authority to bid another go away; and, therefore, trust, that any trick intended to make the meeting thin, will be defeated.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your friend,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 22 Nov. 1809.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

STATE OF FRANCE.—Many have been

the occasions, upon which I have endeavoured to guard my readers against a belief of the reports, published in this country, relative to the pretended *misery and disaffection* of the people in France; which reports have been repeated, perhaps, a thousand times.—The mischief of this delusion, is, that it leads people to rely upon what is not true, and disposes them to slacken in their exertions for their country's defence. To be deceived, in any thing, is mischievous; but every deception of this sort is peculiarly so.—Most of the attempts to deceive the public in this way have been gross enough; but, I do not, at present, recollect any one so very gross as that, which I am about to make a subject of comment; and, what makes it the more necessary to be commented on, is, that it found its way to the public through the pages of the *Morning Chronicle*, which introduced it in a manner calculated to give it as much credit as possible. The introductory words of the editor are as follows:—"The Packet of French Papers which should have been delivered to us on Monday evening, reached our hands yesterday morning. It has furnished us with a regular set of the *Courier de l'Europe* down to the 4th inst. and what is of *more importance*, with a particular detail of the present state of France, written by a Gentleman who has had the *best means of observation*, and upon whose authority we can IMPLICITLY RELY.—The following is the substance of his private letter to us:"—Now, who, from this introduction, would not suppose, that a detail was about to be given, worthy of public reliance? The editor says, that he himself *implicitly* relies upon it; he calls it *important*; and he says his correspondent has had the *best means of observation*.—The article is taken from the *Morning Chronicle* of the 15th instant. I think it necessary to be particular; for, really, it is hard to believe, and I could blame no one for doubting in the existence of such a publication. Besides, it contains a statement respecting the conduct of English prisoners of war in France, of which I should be very sorry to be suspected as the author, or even the promulgator; for, if the fact stated be true, it is indeed of *importance*, but of a most disgraceful nature.—Here, then, is that detail, on which the editor of the *Morning Chronicle* places *implicit reliance*.—The date, as to *place*, is blank: the time is the 4th of November.—"Buona-

"parté passed through Meaux, on the
 "26th October, at three o'clock; he ap-
 "peared unusually pale and fatigued; a
 "handkerchief was tied round his head;
 "on a faint cry of Vive Napoleon! Vive
 "l'Empereur! he *scarcely nodded his head*.
 "His baggage was on its route for
 "Bayonne—troops marching from all
 "parts of the North for Spain. He goes
 "after the meeting of the Senate. Joseph
 "Buonaparté is to be King of Italy. Spain
 "to be treated as a conquered country,
 "and divided into twelve Governments.
 "—Beauharnois is to be King of Po-
 "land; that part lately wrested from the
 "Austrians to form a part of the king-
 "dom.—Not a *light more than the ordi-*
 "*nary lamps* were seen at Paris on the an-
 "nouncing of peace, although the Moni-
 "teur boasted of a general joy and illu-
 "mination; *no such thing*; the Parisians
 "are as *indifferent to any peace on the Con-*
 "*tinent as the Khann of Tartary*. They
 "complain loudly of the Corsican's am-
 "bition; pray for peace with England,
 "with whom they are not enemies. It is the
 "Corsican himself, and those who are en-
 "joying military rank and place, that are
 "for war; *but they wish for repose*. There
 "is no Commerce; Paris presents perfect-
 "ly *splendid misery*; a few carriages, and
 "those by no means convey any great idea of
 "riches. Every trader readily carries
 "his merchandize 25 or 30 per cent. for
 "ready money. Coffee, sugar, cloth, all
 "cotton manufactures, *augment amazingly*
 "*in price*. The theatres not half full, ex-
 "cept in the pit. Bills are stuck up every
 "night at St. Cloud, Malmaison, and in
 "the streets, that the police are employed
 "taking down. The farmers ruined, can-
 "not pay their servants or their labourers,
 "but in kind, *wheat being so cheap and plenti-*
 "*ful*. Where they dare speak, I never was
 "witness to so much discontent, in every de-
 "partment; and this new call of 36,000
 "men (which will be treble) has filled up
 "their *cup of sorrow*. The flower of the
 "army is cut off. The Imperial Guard,
 "not one out of ten, that left Paris in April
 "last, returned without loss of limb or severely
 "wounded: the privates and subaltern officers
 "speak freely. His army is composed of
 "thousands of Prussians, whom he took
 "prisoners, and never suffered to return, in
 "violation of the treaty of peace. The
 "conscripts wound and maim themselves
 "to prevent serving.—The new public
 "works are not paid for: the person
 "who is repairing the Thuilleries, &c.

"has not been paid a sous since two years
 "and then on Government bonds at more
 "than 12 per cent. discount.—Sir Thomas
 "Lavie was thrown into prison and con-
 "veyed at four in the morning to St. Me-
 "nehould, a small fortification near Ver-
 "dun; his papers seized, and no one
 "knew for why—a most wicked breach
 "of good faith, almost as wicked as our
 "detention of the Corsican. They treat
 "our prisoners with *uncommon cruelty*;
 "thumb-screwed, a chain round their necks and
 "bodies, conducted from brigade to bri-
 "gade; nothing but bread, no wine, no
 "beer, no meat, oftentimes without straw,
 "and put into dungeons full of water,
 "chained often with galley slaves or
 "other criminals. This severity has
 "forced many to enter into their service,
 "600 already clothed and armed, passed
 "through Meaux for Bayonne. They swore
 "to me they would desert; above 30 had
 "I am sure, poor fellows, they entered
 "into the service with no other view than
 "running away; but, alas! I fear they
 "will never succeed."—Now, this de-
 "tail does, I think, come completely up
 "to the instructions given by Sir Toby to
 "his brother knight, when the latter is about
 "to write a challenge to his supposed rival.
 "Let it be curt and brief; have as many
 "lies as will lie in thy sheet of paper;
 "let there be gall enough in thy ink;
 "though thou write with a goose pen."
 "—Let us pass over the faint cry of
 "Vive Napoleon, and also the *dim illumina-*
 "tion at Paris, admitting, for the sake of
 "avoiding dispute, that the accounts, which
 "the Moniteur gives of the joy and enthusi-
 "astic loyalty of the people of France, are
 "just about as true as those, given by the
 "Morning Post and other hireling printers,
 "in similar cases, on this side of the water.
 "Let swallow, too, the assertion, that the peo-
 "ple of Paris are quite indifferent about any
 "peace upon the continent, and that they
 "pray for peace with us, whom they love
 "most cordially, and further that they com-
 "plain loudly of the Corsican's ambition.
 "But, stay! We must be cautious how we
 "believe this; because our authentic gen-
 "tleman has, in other parts of his letter,
 "told us that it is only certain persons
 "who dare speak. Here seems to be a little
 "contradiction; and, indeed, if it be true
 "that the Parisians do loudly complain of
 "the Corsican's ambition, they take greater
 "liberties with their sovereign than we
 "ever do with ours, of whom none of us ever
 "dream of complaining, though we have

some little slaughter of our countrymen, and though this war as well as the one before it was begun by our government. If, therefore, the people of France do loudly complain of the conduct of their sovereign, the people of France are not in a state of slavery so very complete.—So, amongst the proof of misery, the “*theatres are not half full.*” How are *our theatres*? The police are employed *taking down.*” How are *our police* employed? Oh! what unfortunate strings to touch upon at this time! But, what are we to think of what this authentic gentleman says about the *losses in the army*? “The flower of the army is *cut off.*” Good God! and is that a subject of *discontent* in France? Are we to believe, that that will cause the people to *hate* their sovereign; and are we to believe this too, just at this time, when we are still hearing the accounts of the Jubilee through the besotted columns of the hired prints? Do the people of France charge their sovereign with the blood of his armies?—“Not one in ten that left Paris, in April last, *without loss of limb, or severely wounded.*” Well, and what then? But, really, one can scarcely help thinking, that this correspondent of the Morning Chronicle was writing ironically. Alas! the French army, though very likely their loss and their sufferings have been great, have not fought and bled and suffered *in vain*: they have returned, though few in number, perhaps, covered with *glory* and not with *disgrace*. The Emperor of France may hold his conquests as the price of his people’s sacrifices. He may say to them, that, if he has called upon them for great services, and great pecuniary sacrifices, he has given them in exchange *perfect security*. His people dread no enemy. They are haunted with no fears of invasion. They are not filled with alarms. They are not *in doubt* as to what may be their fate in six months from any given day. They are, in short, in a *settled* state of things, and they have as much of glory as is necessary even for them.—Paris, it seems, according to the notions of this writer, is in a state of *splendid misery*, and, as a proof of it, he tells us, that there are *very few carriages*. This writer forgets the passage, wherein GOLDSMITH, who, as I take it, full as sound a political philosopher as this gentleman; he forgets the passage, wherein this poet so justly, so poetically, and so feelingly describes the misery, which never fails to accompany

the “rattling chariots’ clash, the torches’ glare.” Perhaps there is no remark that could have been made, better calculated than this, to give a reflecting man a favourable opinion of the change, which the last seventeen years has introduced into France. The fault here is, that it is all carriages, all rattle and glare, in the public parts of the metropolis, while, every where else, real misery prevails; while the poor-rates and the number of paupers are daily augmenting; and while the whole nation is so heavily burdened with taxes, that no man can scarcely call any thing his own.—As if, however, the absence of carriages from the streets of Paris; as if the disappearance, or, at least, the diminution of luxury; as if this were not sufficient to convince us of the *misery* existing in France; as if, to convince us that the people of France are in a miserable state, it were not sufficient to tell us that they are not in danger of being trampled under foot by the horses of loan-jobbers, jews and contractors; as if this were inadequate to the giving of us a just notion of the *misery* of the French people, this gentleman tells us . . . what, think you, reader? You have seen, or you never would have guessed at it, if you had kept on guessing to the end of your life. He gives us as a proof of the misery of the people of France, the fact of “*wheat BEING SO CHEAP AND SO PLENTIFUL.*” There is a proof of *misery*! There is a proof of national misery, and of the terrible effects of the change that has taken place in France! Have a care, Sir, how you promulgate such proofs of French misery; for they might produce, in England, effects that you do not appear to be aware of, especially if the quartern loaf should happen to rise to half a crown or two shillings.—This is, to be sure, a most curious symptom of national misery, and no less curious a source of national discontent. We now know, then, what it is these gentlemen mean when they talk of national misery, national ruin, national destruction, and the like. They mean that state of things, in which there are few coaches and chariots and landaus and curricles, but in which there is plenty of bread. They mean that state of things, in which there are, comparatively speaking, *few persons who live upon the taxes*; few persons who live upon the fruit of the labour, or of the estates, of others. This is what they mean by national misery and destruction; but, I would advise them, if they

really have discovered this to be the case in France, to "keep their own council;" for that, even with the aid of the *fee-losophes* of the Edinburgh Reviewers, they will never persuade the people of England, that the sight of the fine carriages of jews and contractors is preferable to plenty of bread.—But, it seems, this *abundance of wheat* has ruined the farmers.—Well, then, what pretty fellows we must be, who have, in our Common Prayer Book *Forms of Thanksgiving for Plenteousness*? All the maxims of the world are wrong, then? People should pray to be guarded against abundant crops? The arts of tilling and manuring, and the anxieties of the husbandman, are, then, all worse than useless?—"The farmers are ruined, wheat being so cheap and plentiful." If it be plentiful, it will, of course, be cheap. One is a consequence of the other; but, that the growers of corn should be ruined by the abundance of produce is an absurdity too gross to be tolerated for one moment.—They cannot, we are told, "pay their servants or their labourers, but in kind." It was well our gentleman, "who has the best means of information," put in this saving sentence at the end. Sad state, to be sure; the farmers have nothing but corn, that is to say, *nothing* but the means of making food and drink, to give to their servants and labourers; and those means they have in such abundance that they do not know what to do with them?—Oh! wretched farmers! miserable labourers! Unfortunate people of France, such are the effects of that change, which has driven from amongst you the loan-jobbers, farmers of taxes, contractors, Jew-brokers, and all those, whom in former times, you had the honour of seeing drive along the streets in gilt chariots, and to hear of their sumptuous meals upon turtle!—Reader, you must recollect, that that wise man William Pitt, commonly called "an illustrious friend now—no more;" you must recollect, that this "great statesman," at the commencement of his war against France, conceived the brilliant idea of starving that country into submission, and that, with this view, he expended several millions of English taxes. The scheme, brilliant as it was, failed. Pitt promised the parliament that his starving scheme, joined to the breaking up of "public credit" in France, would do the business of the revolutionizers in a very short time. We know this to have turned out a false promise; but our best informed

friend, if he had been of Pitt's council, would have told him, that he went just the wrong way to work; for that, the certain way to ruin a nation was to ensure it, if possible, most abundant crops of every thing, and especially of wheat; that is to say, an abundance of bread.—I do not know how the reader may view this matter, but, to me, it appears very disgraceful to this country, that such absurdities as this should be sent forth to the public, through the columns and under the express recommendation of a print of long standing, and of established character. It is not many weeks since a publication appeared in one of our daily prints, which of them I now forget, giving quite another account of the agricultural state of France. The writer in that case, as well as in this, wished to make us believe that the people of France were miserable, and, of course discontented; but, the former did not, apparently think it likely, that we should be able to discover a source of national misery in the great abundance of wheat and cheapness of bread. Be his thoughts what they might, however; his assertions were, that agriculture was in a neglected state.—The truth is, I believe, that agriculture never was, in France, in a state so flourishing as at this time. There are many reasons why it should be so. Rich lands, in vast quantities, never tilled formerly, began to be tilled the moment the revolutionary fury was over. Nay even during the reign of the DIRECTORY, all those who went to France were surprized to see the rapid improvements in agriculture.—It is of great consequence, that we should see this matter in its true light, because, as to the result of the contest, in which we are now engaged against Buonaparte, it is proper that we should know, that we have no ground for hoping for any assistance whatever from the internal situation of our enemy's country. We should scout all idea of hope built upon such a foundation. We should place "implicit reliance" upon our own exertions; and no reliance at all upon any aid to be derived from any other source.—There is something in the close of this article of "undoubted authority," that I do greatly doubt of, and that I most sincerely hope is false from the beginning to the end.—The reader will anticipate that I allude to the story about the prisoners of war, which is, I think, one of the most shameful that could have been invented.—We are told, that our countrymen who are prisoners in France, are

used in a *very cruel manner*; that they are *thumb-screwed*; that *chains* are put round their *necks and their bodies*; that they are often *chained with galley slaves*; that they have *nothing but bread to eat*; that they are often *without even straw to lie upon*; and are put into *dungeons full of water*.—Had these facts come unaccompanied with any sequel, I should not have believed them. These are so glaringly false, that they could have been believed by nobody; and, besides, they so directly contradict what we *know* to be true with regard to the treatment of our prisoners of war in Spain, that we would think they had been invented for the purpose of throwing discredit upon the channel through which they were conveyed to the public. The *sequel*, however, the sad, the disgraceful sequel, explains the whole at once. It not only shows the facts to be false, but also shows the cause of their invention.—This gentleman of “the best means of information,” and on whose statement we are to place “implicit reliance,” says, that many of our countrymen, who were prisoners of war in France, *have entered into the French service*; have actually become *soldiers in the army of “the CORSICAN!”* And, the writer tells us, that he himself saw *six hundred of them already clothed and armed*, passing through Meaux for Bayonne.—After we have read this our wonder ceases at the account of the chains round the neck and the dungeons full of water; for we see that some such account was absolutely necessary, for the purpose of palliating the disgraceful and ominous fact of the enlistment of Englishmen under the banners of Napoleon.—We are told however, that they *swore they would desert*; that thirty of them had *already deserted*; that the writer is sure they entered into the service with *no other view than that of running away*; but that alas! he is *afraid they will never succeed*.—Leaving the reader to settle the question of morality in this case, I will offer a remark or two upon the *probability* of what is here said as to the views of the persons thus said to have entered into the French service.—But, first, let me say, that I greatly doubt the fact. My doubts may arise from my wishes (for I must wish the fact to be false); but, as I do not believe one word about the alledged cruelty, so I do not believe that any part of our countrymen would be so base as thus to take up arms in the service of our enemy. Upon the supposition, however, that the fact be true, what are the grounds, whereon to

believe, that the men, thus enlisted, mean to desert? What chance will they have of deserting? And where, I should be glad to know, will the *thirty* hide themselves who have deserted in the heart of France? But, the worst circumstance, for the veracity of this writer, is, that the French are marching these men to *Bayonne*; that is to say, to Spain, or to Portugal, where they will find (if they find any body to fight with) an army of their own countrymen; and whither, in short, it would seem, they are sent for the express purpose of affording them the means of deserting, if the fact be, that they are so much disposed to desert. Whatever may be the opinion of the writer, as to the views of these men, there can, I think, be no doubt, that those who have enlisted them are not afraid of their deserting, or, most assuredly, they would have marched them in any direction, other than that of Spain or Portugal.—I repeat my hope, that the whole of this story is false, notwithstanding the Morning Chronicle points it as worthy of the “implicit reliance” of the public. I hope it is false from the beginning to the end; but, upon the supposition of its being true, as to the fact of enlistment, what a contrast does the conduct of our prisoners of war present when set beside that which is, by this same Morning Chronicle, of the very same date, attributed to the *Spanish prisoners of war*.—The facts are thus stated: “We have received letters from Vigo to the date of the 26th ult. By these it appears, that the peasantry of all the adjacent country is provided with pikes or fire arms, and that the inhabitants are in the best disposition to support the public cause. A Gentleman, who has had the good fortune to escape from the French, has just arrived from Spain, and has favoured us with some interesting particulars. What he says with regard to the number of French in the hospitals of Madrid precisely corresponds with what was stated in a letter from that city which we inserted in our Paper of Monday last. He informs us, that all the convents and public buildings at the Spanish capital are full of sick and wounded Frenchmen, who are crowded into them to the number of 18,000. An endeavour was made by Joseph to raise a native regiment under his own banners from the prisoners and others in the vicinity of Madrid; and to facilitate this purpose, two or three thousand of them were kept without

“food for upwards of two days, when they
 “were invited to partake of the Royal
 “bounty, and to enlist under the new
 “King. In this feeble condition, from
 “the want of natural sustenance during so
 “long an interval, the Spaniards *rejected*
 “the proposal, with the exception of two
 “hundred, who entered the ranks. It is
 “said, that the attempt to raise Spanish
 “battalions in France has been yet more
 “unproductive. From 20,000 prisoners,
 “only about 50 Spaniards have been se-
 “duced by ultimate threats and promises,
 “to enrol themselves in the French ser-
 “vice.”—Here, then, if this account be
 true, only two hundred out of twenty thou-
 sand Spanish prisoners in France, have, by
 all the threats and promises, that the French
 have been able to make use of, been in-
 duced to join the armies of the enemy;
 while we are told, that, in one place, six
 hundred English prisoners are actually seen,
 clothed and armed, in the service of that
 enemy. This is a pretty contrast; a con-
 trast to boast of, and just at this time too!
 —I am of opinion, as I said before, that
 the whole of the story is false; and, I think,
 the public will agree with me in thinking,
 that, to say the least of it, the falshood must
 have a very mischievous effect. It is
 right particularly to deprecate any over-
 strained statement respecting the ill-usage
 of our prisoners of war at a time when the
 French have so many of them at their
 mercy. We, who are at home in safety,
 should be very careful how we say any
 thing, that may tend to render more se-
 vere the lot of those of our countrymen,
 who have hazarded their lives in war, and
 whose captivity is, in itself, no bad proof
 of their having been distinguished for
 their bravery.—I have heard from se-
 veral persons, serving in our unfortunate
 army in Spain, a full confirmation of the
 facts stated by Baron Douro as to the good
 and kind treatment of our people left at
 Talavera. Of these facts, therefore, we
 cannot doubt. These facts we *know* to be
 true. Why, then, are we to listen to ano-
 nymous reports, respecting the treatment
 of English prisoners in France?—It has
 been said, that we are indebted to Mar-
 shals Mortier and Victor for the kind
 treatment of the prisoners at Talavera, and
 not to the Emperor Napoleon; but, does
 the reader believe, can any man of com-
 mon sense believe, that those Marshals
 would have so acted towards our prisoners, if
 they had suspected, or had had the small-
 est reason to suspect, that their so acting

was contrary to the wishes of Napoleon?
 Nay, must not every one be well assured,
 that those Marshals knew, that their kind
 and generous conduct towards our coun-
 trymen would be agreeable to their mas-
 ter? And, is it not, then, very wrong to
 pretend to believe; to seem as if we be-
 lieved, these stories, these utterly incredi-
 ble stories, of the cruelties practised upon
 our countrymen, who are prisoners of war
 in France!—I trust that these remarks
 will have some effect towards inducing
 the editors of papers to be more cautious
 how they give circulation to statements,
 arising evidently from the resentment of
 individuals, but calculated to produce, in
 so many ways, effects injurious to the
 country.

CHANGE OF MINISTRY.—In my article,
 upon this subject, published last week, I
 commented upon a paragraph in the
 Morning Chronicle, and put some ques-
 tions directly to Mr. PERRY, the proprie-
 tor of that paper. These questions he has,
 in his paper of the 21st instant, *noticed*, but
 not *answered*. As it were, however, by
 way of compensation for this omission, he
 has commented, with no little severity,
 upon my conduct in the present instance,
 and, indeed, upon my political motives
 and conduct in general.—Before I set
 about an answer to these comments I shall
 introduce an article or two from the same
 print, upon the subject of the proposed
 change of ministry. I do it for this rea-
 son. Mr. PERRY will be found to accuse
 me of a desire to cure the evils of the coun-
 try by *rebuilding*, by which he means, that
 I would first *pull down*. By these extracts
 I shall shew what sort of building he thinks
 we have to deal with, and whether his
 wishes are for pulling down or for re-
 pairing.—The first extract relates to
 the alledged conduct of Lord Wellesley,
 and, if true, most curious facts it contains.
 —“There is a most singular story in the
 “political circles which merits publicity.
 “It is perfectly well known, that both
 “Mr. Canning and Mr. Perceval sent dis-
 “patches to Lord Wellesley, informing
 “him of the convulsion that had broken
 “up the late Administration; and of
 “the ascendancy gained by Mr. Perceval
 “—of the offer that had been made by
 “him to Lord Grenville and Lord Grey—
 “of their rejection—and also containing
 “the offer, by Mr. Perceval, of the Fo-
 “reign Office to the Noble Marquis. We
 “understand, that by some accident,
 “which remains yet to be explained, Mr.

“Canning’s dispatch did not reach the Noble Lord; but Mr. Perceval’s was faithfully delivered to him. He had, therefore, only Mr. Perceval’s statement of the *cabal* before him, but which of course came corroborated by the testimony of Mr. Wellesley Pole, who had accepted the place of Irish Secretary under the new firm. Whether the Noble Marquis thought, however, that further information was necessary—that the aspect of things might change even before his letter could arrive in England—that Mr. Perceval’s footing was not sure—or what other presentiment struck him we cannot say; but we understand he confined himself in his answer to all his friends, *except one*, to a simple declaration, that he had no engagement with Mr. Canning that could preclude him from accepting a responsible situation in the Cabinet with Mr. Perceval and Lord Liverpool; but said, that he had inclosed his determination at length, as to the specific offer made to him, in a letter addressed to his friend Mr. Sydenham, who would of course make it known. Accordingly, there is a large packet, *duly sealed* by the Noble Lord’s splendid seal of arms, addressed to Mr. Sydenham, still lying in the Secretary of State’s Office *un-opened*, Mr. Sydenham having been dispatched on a special mission to Seville, before this important packet arrived in England! This has given rise to observations of the most *lively* kind; as it is facetiously conjectured that the packet may contain *more than one letter*.”—This is pretty well, I think.—It having been found, that Lord Wellesley was willing to join the ministry, the Morning Chronicle appears to have thought less reserve necessary towards him; and, accordingly, on the 15th instant, it boldly speaks out thus:—“Never was failure more complete than Lord Wellesley’s in Spain. He has not succeeded in a single object of his mission. He has neither expelled the French, nor reformed the Junta; neither united the people, nor conciliated the government. He loitered in England, till it was too late to check the rashness or assist the valour of his brother; and he has found at Seville, that Spaniards are neither dazzled by the splendor of an Asiatic retinue, nor overpowered with the exuberance of an Oriental style. His exhortations, his remonstrances, his menaces, have been

“thrown away upon the Junta, but assisted by other causes, they have kindled a flame among the people, of which, it is difficult to say who will be the victims, or what the duration or the extent. A storm is gathering in that quarter, which our Lord Wellesley has no disposition to encounter. *Political courage* is not, “on *this side of the Cape* at least,” in the number of his virtues. We all remember the time when his fears, not his friendship, kept him from the highest situation but one of the government. With characters like his, the present danger is always the most alarming, and therefore we were not surprised to hear, that he had so readily acquiesced in the first proposals of Mr. Perceval. But he, who shrinks from popular commotions at Seville, will seek in vain for courage in England, to face, day after day, in a popular assembly, an eloquent, an indignant, an injured opponent. That the possession of the Treasury might inspire that confidence we will not deny; and we have no doubt in asserting, and Ministers know it to be the case, that he accepted their overtures in the belief, that *this splendid prize was included in their offer*. Impatient to get away from Seville, he instantly announced his intention of returning, but before he had begun his journey the news of Lord Grenville and Lord Grey being sent for arrived most inopportunately, to suspend his purpose, and detain him there, like Prince Volscius, in the Rehearsal, with one boot on and another off, uncertain what course to resolve upon. What will be his decision when Mr. Sydenham assures him that negotiation is at an end, but that Mr. Perceval means to keep the Treasury to himself, the appearance of things at Seville will probably determine. If a Government is likely to be established there, which he can hope to direct, he will prefer a Pro-Consular sway in the Court of a dependant Ally, to an inferior, subordinate, or inactive situation at home. But, if the Junta are obstinate, and the populace riotous, he will obey Mr. Perceval’s call, and if refused the first place in Administration on his return, he will probably retire to the obscurity from which he so lately emerged, and seek in the shade of private life consolation for the disappointments of ambition. To those who recollect Lord Mornington at the Treasury Board, reciting his annual oration by Mr. Pitt’s

"*permission*, and condemned to silence for
 "the remainder of the Session, it must
 "appear a strange caprice of fortune, that
 "could have elevated Lord Wellesley to be
 "the hope and prop of an Administration.
 "But such is the fallen state to which the
 "crooked policy of half a century has degraded
 "the once free and respectable Government of
 "England. A troop of hungry Barristers,
 "who have got possession of the lucrative
 "Offices of State, have need of an Actor
 "to personate the character of a States-
 "man; and as none can be found in the
 "metropolis to accept their offers, they
 "are forced to have recourse to provincial
 "Theatres for some one to complete their
 "Company. But they who look to Lord
 "Wellesley for active support in danger,
 "or for extraordinary resources in coun-
 "sel, have widely mistaken his character
 "and means. A giant and hero among the
 "Hindoos, he quitted Lilliput for Brob-
 "dignag when he returned to Europe."

—What! Mr. Perry, has there, then,
 been crooked policy in this government
 for half a century? Is the "*once-free and*
 "*respectable government of England de-*
 "*graded*"? Are we now ruled by "*a*
 "*troop of hungry lawyers*?" Is all this
 true? And, if it be all true, what sort of
 a thing have we got over us, called a Go-
 vernment? But, whether true or not
 true, I defy you to shew, that I have ever
 spoken of the government in this way.
 No: to take such liberties is a privilege
 peculiar to you men of party, who all un-
 derstand one another, and who are known
 to mean no harm to the good old common
 cause of place and pension.—But, let
 us take one more article. Let us hear
 your description of those, who now govern
 us; of those who have the management
 of our internal concerns, and who are to
 defend us against all the mighty means and
 mightier genius of our enemy. "Next to
 "the mismanagement of public affairs,
 "the distribution of Places to incapable
 "men, forms the most conspicuous part of
 "the conduct of the present wretched
 "Ministry. The appointment of Mr.
 "Croker to the Admiralty has attracted
 "universal notice, and Lord Palmerston,
 "as Secretary at War, and some say, a
 "Member of the Cabinet, (though *this we*
 "*cannot believe*) almost surpasses Mr. Cro-
 "ker. But that both these eminent States-
 "men might be kept in countenance we
 "now have Mr. Huskisson's office, one of
 "the most difficult, delicate, and import-
 "ant under Government, confided to Mister

"Richard Wharton, or Warton, another
 "*broken down Barrister*, only known by his
 "attempts at raising the cry of Jacobi-
 "nism last year, and only recommended
 "by that illustrious nobleman Lord Lons-
 "dale. We have long heard that his
 "Lordship is supposed to have the patron-
 "age of one Cabinet Place, if not two—
 "the giving away of it—the appointment
 "of Lord Mulgrave—the nomination to
 "the supreme direction of Naval Affairs.
 "This has been long talked of; and it
 "now appears, that beside various lesser
 "things, Lord Lonsdale is also *complimented*
 "*with a Secretaryship of the Treasury*. It
 "is also suspected that he has insisted
 "upon the appointment of his Attorney,
 "Sir James Graham, of Lincoln's Inn, as
 "Chairman of the Ways and Means.—
 "Nor can there be a doubt, that if he asks
 "it, Ministers must give it. It may in-
 "deed be expected, that when briefless
 "Barristers fill the higher stations, from
 "the absolute impossibility of inducing
 "any other men to take them under such a
 "Ministry, the next Places should fall to
 "the lot of worn-out Attornies. Whether
 "all this Lowther patronage may suit the
 "House of Commons as well as it does
 "Mr. Perceval, and the Noble Lord in
 "question, we presume not to anticipate
 "—but this we will assert—that no ex-
 "pedient ever was devised more surely
 "calculated to bring Government into
 "universal contempt—more admirably
 "fitted to alienate the people from their
 "Rulers, than this shameless distribution
 "of the highest Offices in the State. In
 "God's name, let Lord Palmerston go
 "stand for one of the vacancies now con-
 "tested at Cambridge—and let Lord Lons-
 "dale and his Mulgraves, his Wards, his
 "Whartons, his Grahams, his Sons, his
 "Servants, &c. be provided for out of his
 "100,000*l.* a year in the North—but let
 "not the Country be told, that it is a mat-
 "ter of perfect indifference who is Se-
 "cretary at War, or Secretary of the
 "Treasury, or First Lord of the Admi-
 "ralty—for this is the practical lesson
 "taught by those scandalous appoint-
 "ments. Among a thousand other evils,
 "this obvious one arises from it—that
 "it degrades the stations in question.
 "What man fit to serve his Country, can
 "step into the Offices just held by such
 "persons as the Lord Palmerston and
 "the Sieur Wharton, without reluctance,
 "without feeling that the Place has been
 "rendered unfit for him?"—Thus, then,

Mr. Perry asserts, or he obviously intends his readers should believe that we are now under the rule of *broken down Barristers* and *worn out Attornies*; that Lord Lonsdale in consequence of his borough-power, has the patronage, the actual giving away, of a place in the cabinet, that is to say, that he has, in fact, the appointment of one of those few servants (not above ten or eleven in number) to whom the king entrusts the conducting of the great affairs of the nation, and who, as it is well known, sit in council with the king himself.—This Mr. Perry tells his readers; and, after that, I should not have expected him to find fault of any one, as wishing to go *too far*; for, I am quite at a loss to know, how it is possible for any man to go farther in his ideas of the degradation of the government.—We now come to the article, wherein Mr. Perry comments upon my conduct and views, which article professes to be an *answer* to mine of last week, on the subject of a change of ministry. We shall presently see what sort of answer this is; and whether it be worthy of the name of answer; but, before I insert it I must observe, that if my article was worth so pointed and so long a commentary, on the part of Mr. Perry, it was worth inserting in the same paper along with the commentary, and if it had been so inserted, Mr. Perry's readers would have been able to judge between him and me. But, this practice of laying before your reader *all your adversary has to say*, is what I never saw followed by any one but myself. It is, however, what fairness demands; and, indeed, it is what bare truth demands, especially if, as was the case in this instance, the insertion be attended with no possible inconvenience. Mr. Perry had more columns, than were necessary for this purpose, filled with matter very uninteresting. He allows that this subject is of great importance. He seems to be fully persuaded of the necessity of combatting what I have written upon it. But, does he think, that the way to succeed in this, is to comment upon what he will not, if he can help it, suffer his readers to see?—The reader will bear in mind, that ever since the pistolling affair, and the consequent confusion and chopping and intriguing and plotting amongst the people in power, Mr. Perry has with all his powers of statement and of reasoning (and they are not small,) been recommending a change of mi-

nistry; that is to say, the turning of these people out and the putting of the late ministry in their place. This, as he says, would be for the good of the nation, and, indeed, according to him, such change is absolutely necessary for the preventing of this country from falling into a state of utter ruin.—I, in my last Number (page 750) combatted these opinions. I asserted, and, I think, pretty clearly proved, that, unless the *out-faction* would do certain things, their coming into place could produce no good to the nation. Referring the reader now to the article itself, I shall, without further preface, insert the comments of Mr. Perry, which, as the reader will perceive, may be, without any great hazard of mistake, regarded as containing the sentiments of the what is called the *Whig* part of the *outs*. “It is the invariable fortune “of *The Morning Chronicle* to be persecuted, with equal bitterness of hostility, “by Mr. Cobbett on the one hand, *for not going far enough*, and by *The Courier*, “for going too far. Mr. Cobbett, in his “paper of Saturday last, puts forth ten “questions which we are called upon to “answer *seriatim*; and *The Courier* charges “us, *point blank*, with rank and confirmed “*Jacobinism*, because we have ventured to “oppose the unprecedented and (as we “think) flagitious attack on the people by “the monopolists of the Theatre.—We are “prepared to answer both our adversaries.—We cannot conceive a more effectual mode of supporting any Administration, however feeble, corrupt, or “hostile to the rights and interests of “Englishmen, than the course which Mr. “Cobbett pursues. He does not attempt, “like the *Courier*, to palliate the misconduct of the men who are content to occupy the seats, without possessing the “power of Government; but he sets up an “irrational cry, that their opponents are “equally bad, equally corrupt, and equally inimical to their country. There is “nothing, to be sure, more easy, nor “more summary, than this course of proceeding. It saves all reasoning, prevents all discussion, and if it does not “satisfy the inquisitive, the discerning, “and the impartial part of mankind, imposes on the ignorant and the idle, while “it gratifies the unprincipled; for there “is a malignant feeling which makes “the guilty receive with complacency “the foulest imputations upon those who “disdain their fellowship.—We can-

“not, indeed, conceive any thing more
 “degrading to human nature, or more
 “flagitious, than an attempt to confound
 “all the degrees and distinctions that ex-
 “ist among us, and to reduce all intellect
 “to one level. It is a species of calumny
 “that is even blasphemous. It is a denial
 “of the dispensations of Providence, and
 “a wilful blindness to the physical and
 “moral order of the universe. Mr. Cob-
 “bett is too shrewd an observer of the
 “palpable varieties in the scale of human
 “understanding, to deceive himself into a
 “belief of the slander which yet he pro-
 “pagates. He makes use of it with his
 “eyes open to its fallacy. But it is con-
 “venient, and saves a world of labour. It
 “strikes directly at the great object,
 “which he seems systematically since his
 “last conversion, to pursue, viz. to aim
 “at the deliverance of the nation from all
 “its grievances, rather by convulsive than
 “by moderate means. We do not im-
 “pute to him the treasonable thought of
 “the overthrow of his country; but we
 “think he would rather save it by rebuild-
 “ing than repairing the fabric: and he
 “is well aware that the predecessors of
 “the present Ministers are not of his
 “order of reformers. He knows that they
 “are men gifted with minds and hearts
 “to preserve, and not to destroy, and that
 “they are infinitely more likely than the
 “present Ministers to prevent (if human
 “sagacity can now prevent) the ruin of
 “the Empire, without resorting to the
 “desperate remedies which he recom-
 “mends.—When, therefore, he asks us
 “whether they would take off or lower
 “the existing taxes—we say, distinctly,
 “that we verily believe they would main-
 “tain inviolate the faith of the nation,
 “well knowing that its honesty is its
 “strength, and that the slightest infringe-
 “ment of our obligations would be irre-
 “parable ruin. The diminution of taxes
 “must, therefore, be the slow consequence
 “of a change of system, not the forerunner
 “of it, and though their Administration
 “might end in the material ease of our
 “burthens, it could not begin with such a
 “measure.—But as to the institution
 “of the most rigorous inquiry into “the
 ““important matter of the *Droits of the*
 ““*Admiralty*—the reform of the *Prize*
 ““*Courts*—the lopping off of unmerited
 ““Pensions and Sinécures—the reduction
 ““of all useless parts of the Army”—and
 “generally as to a systematic and vigilant
 “correction of abuse in every department

“of the State—we can only say, that we
 “should be ashamed of the preference we
 “give to these honourable men over their
 “opponents, if we did not religiously give
 “them credit for their avowed determina-
 “tion to introduce and to practise an uni-
 “versal economy in the conduct of our
 “affairs. We will say more—We believe
 “that it is the persuasion, that such is their
 “principle and rule of conduct, that con-
 “stitutes the sole obstacle to their employ-
 “ment.—We of course can judge only
 “of the intentions of public men by their
 “public acts. We have no pretensions
 “to secret or to confidential intercourse.
 “What may be their line of proceeding
 “with regard to Hanover we certainly do
 “not affect even to conjecture; because,
 “in the present state of European politics,
 “it is scarcely to be considered at all.
 “The employment of mercenaries in
 “England every constitutional man must
 “deplore; and as to a Reform of the Re-
 “presentation of the People in Parliament,
 “we can only say, that we have uniformly
 “and earnestly urged it as the wholesome,
 “sound, and practical means of restoring
 “to the Legislature the power of making
 “responsibility more than a name. We
 “pretend not to speak for others; but
 “we should imagine that to the simple and
 “effectual Reform, of which we have al-
 “ways been the friends, there is no great
 “objection to be found in any quarter.”

—Taking the several parts of this article,
 in the order in which they lie before us,
 the first thing to be noticed is, the asser-
 tion at the very outset, namely, that I
 persecute Mr. Perry for *not going far*
enough. Now, pray, Mr. Perry, *when* did
 I accuse you of *not going far enough*? This
 assertion has no foundation whatever; and,
 it appears to have been made solely with a
 view of forming a set-off against the charge
 of Jacobinism, preferred by the Courier.
 As if you had said: “look, here is proof
 “that I am no Jacobin, for Mr. Cobbett
 “*persecutes me for not going far enough*.”—
 You, in these comments, next charge me
 with “setting up an irrational cry, that the
 “opponents of the present ministers are
 “equally bad, equally corrupt, and equal-
 “ly inimical to their country.” This
 you stigmatize as casting foul imputations,
 and as calculated to gratify malice. But,
 Sir, you seem to have forgotten, that I
 produced *reasons* for thinking the *outs* just
 as bad as the *ins*; that I produced *facts*,
 too, in support of my opinion; and I can
 hardly think, that you are vain enough to

suppose, that my opinion, so supported, is to be upset by your bare assertion, or, rather, without any distinct assertion, but a sort of sweeping condemnation of what I had asserted upon proof. This is not the way to *answer* any one, and particularly me, who deal so much in facts and so little in speculation.—You say, that I “attempt to confound all the degrees and distinctions that exist amongst us, and to reduce all intellect to one level;” and this you describe as calumnious and blasphemous and every thing else that is bad. This charge also is wholly untrue. I have never made any such attempt. I have never pretended, that the *outs* had no more talent than the *ins*. I have never said, and I am sure I have never thought, that the two factions were upon a level in point of intellect. But, what I have said, and what I have thought; what I still say, and what I still think, is, that, *with respect to their views and intentions as to all those matters in which the people have an interest*, they are perfectly upon a level; and that, therefore, any change of ministry, which should produce merely the shifting of the salaries from the *ins* to the *outs*, would be useless to the nation. These, Sir, were my propositions. To these you should have given an answer. But, to these you could have given no answer, because they are notoriously true; and, therefore, you chose to pass them over, and, in their stead, to invent propositions for me, which you found it more easy to manage. No, Sir, I deny your charge. It is not a *level of intellect* that I have insisted on, but a level of views and intentions as to *all those points in which the people are interested*. And, if this be the case, why should we prefer one faction to the other? You should have shown, that this was not the case. You should have shown us in what respect the *outs* differ from the *ins* in their political views and principles; but especially in those views and intentions by which the people are likely to be affected. This is what you should have done, and this you have left even unattempted; though you set out with telling your readers, that you are prepared to answer me. The course of the matter was this: You called upon us to come forward and petition for a change of ministry; I say, “no,” because the *outs* have, towards us, just the same views and intentions as the *ins*; you publish what you call an *answer* to this, and in this answer you talk of my attempting to level all intellect, of my being

blasphemous, of my denying the dispensations of Providence, of my attempting to degrade human nature, of my imposing on the ignorant, of my gratifying the unprincipled, of my being guilty of calumny and slander; of all this and a great deal more do you talk, but not one word do you say to the main point, not one word do you say, in order to disprove what I asserted, namely, that, with regard to whatever was really interesting to the people, the views and intentions of both factions were the same. And this is your way of *answering*, is it, Sir?—What, you do, then, acquit me of “the treasonable thought of the overthrow of the country”? Gramercy! I’ll bear your kindness in remembrance, believe me. You only impute to me the wish to save the country “by rebuilding rather than by repairing the fabric,” which you afterwards explain to mean a wish to “destroy” by the use of the “desperate remedies,” which I recommend.—Here, Sir, as in the former case, you answer facts and reasoning by bare assertion; and by assertion, too, unconnected with the subject. It was not *my* political principles that were under examination, but those of the two contending factions. Since, however, you have chosen this course of proceeding, let me ask you what “desperate remedies,” what “destroying” measures, I have ever proposed? I have urged, and I still urge; I still insist that without what I urge, that it is no matter who is in power or what else takes place; I still urge, such a reform in parliament as will give the people a voice there; and what is this more than was contended for by Mr. GREY, who is now Lord Grey, and who is one of the persons, whom you hold up to us as capable of saving the nation? Give me what he proposed, and I will be contented. I think his plan was too complex and was not quite consistent as to principle; but, give me that, and you shall not hear me complain. What, then, is there “desperate” in this? How does this denote a wish to “destroy”? Sir, these imputations against me evidently arise from the vexation you feel at not being able to answer me. You are angry with me for reducing you to the necessity of acknowledging, either expressly or tacitly, that you have a bad cause. You know, that the faction, whom you endeavour to support, have deceived the people; you know that their intentions towards the people are no better than those of their rivals for place and profit;

you know, that if the great question of reform was brought forward, some of its most resolute enemies would be found in your faction; and, because I say all this; because I say, what you know to be the truth, you have the injustice to cast upon me imputations which you know to be unfounded.—When, Sir, you took up your pen, upon this occasion, you appear to have formed a scale of answer from which you afterwards departed. What we say of boys and their bread-and-cheese seems applicable to you and your commentary: your eye was bigger than your stomach. When your readers heard you say, that Mr. Cobbett had put TEN QUESTIONS to you, and heard you add, that you were prepared to answer him, they must naturally have expected to find an answer to each question; an answer immediately to the point; a plain intelligible answer; in short, an answer, for nothing which does not answer to this description is worthy of the name of answer. But, Sir, how have you answered these ten questions? Let us see, re-inserting the questions as we proceed, especially as you have not done it.

First then, Would they, who nearly doubled the *Income Tax*, take off any part of that tax, render the imposition of it more equitable, or make the collection of it less odious and vexatious?

2nd, Would they take off, or diminish any tax whatever; or would they, in any way, lighten the pecuniary burdens that we bear, and that have subjected us to the almost daily visits of the tax-gatherer?

Now, what answer have we to these? The questions are as plain as words can make them. The answer is this: "When, therefore, he asks us, whether they "would take off, or lower the existing "taxes, we say, *distinctly*" (mark this!) "we say, *distinctly*, that we verily believe, "that they would maintain inviolate the "faith of the nation, well knowing that its "honesty is its strength, and that the "slightest infringement of our obligations "would be irreparable ruin. The diminution of taxes must, therefore, be the "slow consequence of a change of system, "not the fore-runner of it, and, though "their administration might end in the "material ease of our burdens, it could not "begin with such a measure."—This might all have been saved by the use of the monosyllable NO; for, it is plain from

what is said, that even Mr. Perry does not expect, that the outs would attempt any thing in the way of reducing our enormous expenditure. But, you perceive, that he passes over the first question; takes no notice at all of it; but amuses his readers with a statement of his creed as to national morality; as if my questions called for any such statement! What has national faith and honesty to do with the mode of imposing and collecting the Income Tax? Does he mean, that, unless this tax remains, and is imposed and collected in the same manner that it now is, the faith of the nation will be forfeited? What does he mean then?—At any rate, he plainly enough tells us, that the outs would suffer this tax to remain just what it now is; and, if so, I am quite certain that I would as soon have the produce of it expended by Mr. Perceval as by Lord Grey or any body else. If I am to have my property taken from me, without the power of appealing to a jury as to whether it be taken away justly or unjustly, I care not one straw whether it be expended by the ins or by the outs.

3rd, Would they, frankly agreeing to a fair inquiry in the case, put to rights the important matter of the *Droits of Admiralty*?

4th, Would they, setting the influence of lawyers at defiance, reform the Prize Courts, and give to the Navy what is now, to the infinite injury of the country, swallowed up by Proctors and Advocates, and an endless list of law officers?

5th, Would they lop off all unmerited Pensions and Sinécures, beginning with those of themselves and their families?

6th, Would they reduce all the useless parts of the Army; introduce an impartiality of Promotion, taking merit as the sole ground thereof; and would they, in all promotions, employments, and contracts, in the Army as well as in the Navy, set borough-mongering influence at nought, and consult the public good, and that only?

To these questions we have nothing but the following general and vague sort of answer: "We can only say, that we should "be ashamed of the preference we give to "these honourable men over their opponents, if we did not religiously" (in the jubilee way, I suppose,) "give them credit "for their avowed determination to introduce and to practise an universal economy

“in the conduct of our affairs.” *Æconomy!* Why, it is not merely *æconomy* that these questions point at. They point at, nay, they speak of, matters deeply interesting to the *efficiency* of our navy and our army. How are these huddled together and confounded by the word *æconomy*, and *universal æconomy* too! I ask, will your faction reform the prize-courts and give to the navy what is now uselessly swallowed up by proctors and advocates? To this what answer do I get? Why, “we verily believe they will practise an *universal æconomy*.” This is no answer to the questions. It is no answer to any one of them; nor does the answerer express even an opinion as to what his faction would do, relative to these important matters.—But, let us stop here to notice an observation, of the tendency of which the writer does not appear to have been fully aware. After stating, that he is thoroughly persuaded, that the *outs* are determined to introduce and practise an universal *æconomy* in the conduct of our affairs, he says, “We will say more—we believe, that it is the *persuasion*, that such is their principle and rule of conduct, that constitutes the sole obstacle to their employment.”—That is to say, in plain English, that they are kept out of power solely because they are known to wish to save the public money. Now, then, Mr. Perry, who is it that keeps them out of power? Who is it that dislikes them because they wish to spare our purses? Who is it that is such an enemy of the people? Answer me this, thou moderate gentleman, who do not wish to rebuild, but to repair. Who is it that you mean? And, are we not in a pretty situation, if there does exist any person or persons, having the will and possessing the power, to keep men out of office, solely because those men would, if in office, endeavour to alleviate the burdens of the people by preventing, as much as possible, a wasteful expenditure? I do not like insinuations. Why did not Mr. Perry tell us who it was he meant as keeping the *outs* from power, solely because they were desirous of saving the people’s money?—The remaining questions I will now put, one by one, and the answer to each immediately after it.

Qu. 7. Would they, in all questions relating to Hanover, think only of the interests of England, and not think Hanover as dear to us as Hampshire?

Ans. “What may be their line of conduct with regard to Hanover, we certainly do not affect even to conjecture; because, in the present state of European politics, it is scarcely to be considered at all.”

Qu. 8. Would they dispense with the services of a great body of foreign Mercenaries, kept on foot in this kingdom, and paid out of the fruit of the people’s labours?

Ans. “The employment of mercenaries in England every constitutional man must deplore.”

Qu. 9. Would they, if Mr. Madocks’s motion were renewed, for an inquiry into the circumstances of the Sale of a Seat in the House of Commons to Mr. Quintin Dick, support that motion?

Alas! not one word of answer to this. Not a syllable, good, bad, or indifferent!

Qu. 10. Would they bring forward, and maintain, with all their might, the desired measure of Parliamentary Reform, restoring to the great body of the people of property their due weight, and making the House of Commons in reality “the representatives of the people?”

Ans. “As to a reform of the representation of the people in parliament, we can only say, that we have uniformly and earnestly urged it, as the wholesome and sound and practical means of restoring to the legislature the power of making responsibility more than a name. We pretend not to speak for others,” (O, oh!), “but we should imagine, that, to the simple and effectual reform, of which we have always been the friends, there is no great objection to be found in any quarter.”

I wish, while you had the pen in your hand, Sir, you had just taken the pains to tell us what sort of a reform that is, to which you have always been a friend. But, you only imagine; you expressly say, that you do not speak for others; and, I am fully persuaded, that those others are far indeed from being of your way of thinking upon this all-important point. The writers who speak for those others, as to this matter, are the Edinburgh Reviewers, well-known to be closely connected with many of them, and these Reviewers have lately told us, that any change, which should give the people a voice in the

House of Commons, would be injurious to the nation, and would, indeed, *infallibly destroy the kingly government*.—From your manner of expression, at the close of your comments, one would suppose, that, to a reform to a certain extent; such a reform as that proposed by Mr. GREY, your party would have *no objection*. Will they say so? Has any such expression escaped them? I believe not.—You (and they, too, I dare say,) complain, that Lord Lonsdale has the *giving away* of a seat in the king's cabinet council; and you represent this council as being, in fact, the mere nominees of those, *who have influence in the House of Commons*. Now, is this so? You talk of my uttering calumny; you talk of my slandering; but, if this be not true, what are you guilty of? And, if it be true, is it not idle to talk of a *change of ministry*, unless you can, at the same time, put down this influence in the House of Commons? Is it not a shame for a man of sense and of talents to feign a hope of any national good, unless such reform take place as shall do away this deadly influence?—If, indeed, your faction would state to the people what you have stated; if they would tell us that they have no objection to an effectual reform, such a reform as would *render responsibility something more than a name*; if they would tell us, that they would give us such a reform, then, indeed, we might begin to conceive hopes. But, no such thing do they tell us. There are some persons, who would be satisfied with the restoration of *triennial Parliaments*, without any thing more. Not even those persons have been able to extort even a nod of assent from any of your party. Why, then, should any of us, any single soul amongst us, wish for their exaltation to power? Will they promise us, that they will bring to *punishment* any predecessor who has abused his power? Not a man of them will promise any such thing; but, on the contrary, would call us fools, if we were weak enough to expect it. *Why, then; I will repeat my question 'till I weary you; why, then, I say, should we wish for any change of men;—“ I pause for “ a reply.”*

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, Thursday, 23 Nov. 1809.

A letter of Mr. WAITHMAN, inserted below, I beg leave to recommend to the particular attention of my readers.

ADDRESS TO THE CITIZENS OF LONDON.

MR. COBBETT,

SIR;—I feel highly obliged to you for your endeavours to bring back the Citizens of London to a proper sense of their duty. I am anxious, as far as in me lies, to retrieve my own character and theirs from the shame and obloquy which must attach to it by confiding such an important trust into the hands of men, who have given us such flagrant proofs of folly and want of principle. You will therefore oblige me by publishing the following Address to my fellow-citizens:— I am, yours, &c.

FELLOW-CITIZENS!

The conduct of our Common Council demands our serious attention: The state of the Country imperiously calls for it; and we have no other alternative than to restore to the Corporation the dignity and independence it has lost, or to surrender all pretensions ourselves, not only to character, but to those rights which our ancestors fought for and obtained, and which the most affluent, the most temperate and most virtuous amongst us acknowledge to be worth preserving, even at the hazard of our lives.

In calling your attention to the disgraceful proceedings of the Common Council for the last twenty five years, I entreat you to recur to its transactions, previous to that period; you will then be the better enabled to mark the shameless depravity of the present times by contrasting it with the manly and decisive firmness with which the open, or insidious attacks of the ministers of the crown were resisted, whenever they attempted, by trick or by violence, to render the Citizens of London subservient to their designs. No longer the intrepid Champions of our Constitutional rights:—no longer the vigilant guardians of our honour and interests; or the stern opposers of ministerial encroachments—the Common Council have shewn themselves the willing advocates of a system of corruption which is sapping the very foundations of the government it pretends to support.

Instead of approaching the throne with firmness, in the language of truth: instead of insisting, as they are bound to do, on an inquiry into the scandalous waste of

Public Money, and the wanton sacrifice of lives in hazardous enterprises and unwholesome climates: instead of opposing with courage equal to the magnitude of the occasion, the enormous abuses which dishonour and impoverish the nation:—we find the Common Council the mere agents of succeeding factions, partaking of that infamy it should expose and extinguish, giving to crime, and imbecility, the plaudits due only to virtue and to wisdom.

There is not in the United Kingdom, a city, borough, town, or village, where the Common Council has not become the subject of severe animadversion, of scoff and of ridicule. The public journals, the theatre, and the print shops, have equally contributed to the exposure of their folly, ignorance and selfishness; nor are we, my fellow Citizens, exempt from the censure it has incurred; seeing that it could only have proceeded from our criminal supineness and neglect, that men so unworthy and incapable, should have been chosen as our representatives in the Corporation. If their turpitude have brought our fortunes into hazard, their guilt is less blameable than our indolence and indiscretion, in making such improper selections. Their ignorance and incapacity prepared us, in some sort, for the baseness and venality we have experienced; the country has reason to expect from us a choice more worthy the character of the Citizens of the metropolis of the British Empire.

It may not yet be too late in some measure to repair the injury they have done us, and secure the level which we have lost. In short, our right annually to elect persons to represent us in Common Council has acquired a value beyond what it ever before possessed in any period of our history. Let us estimate it according to its full worth. Let us, by a manly discharge of our duty at this perilous moment, endeavour to retrieve our own character, and save the empire. The Aldermen were once elected annually; this privilege was lost by our neglecting to exercise it. The want of this prudent check may account for their neglect of our interest and contempt for our opinion. Their basking in the sunshine of court favour, with pensions, titles, contracts, loans, jobs and appointments, more than sufficiently atone to them for the loss of our confidence and respect. No longer in danger of being dismissed; they hold their situations for life, as some of the Common Council are well disposed to do, and who really, by their conduct,

seem to consider themselves fixtures beyond the reach of our authority, owing to their having been suffered to continue, year after year, in office, although, year after year, they have forfeited all claim to the distinction.

Are you aware that, by abstaining from the annual exercise of this invaluable right, we are virtually constituting it an office for life? As we have annual elections, let the use of them be marked with firmness and discrimination, by dismissing those who are undeserving of our favour, and electing men of ability and public principle. By such conduct we shall put a stop to the infamous traffic, the dishonourable but profitable intercourse carried on between the members of that Court and the Treasury.

I am very far from insinuating, that all the members of the Corporation merit this censure. On the contrary, there are several who well deserve our esteem; and the best proof we can give of our confidence in their integrity, will be to return them at the ensuing Elections to the post they have so honourably filled. To such men it will be the most gratifying recompence we can bestow upon their fidelity; and while our approbation serves as a stimulus, to future, and I trust more effectual exertions, it will confirm them the more strongly in an inflexible attachment to our rights and interests.—In the late disgraceful contentions at Guildhall, the conduct of these men, opposed to the venal and selfish hirelings of that Court, offers a contrast too striking to escape your notice: and it is owing to the firm stand they made, that the majority were driven back, and the corporation has been rescued from the odium of appropriating from our impoverished funds, those sums in feasting and rioting, which we have since had the felicity to behold applied to releasing the captive, and solacing the afflicted.

Having called these important facts to your recollection, and, in order to impress them more strongly on your mind, requested you to look to the actual state of the Country, I conjure you not to treat the office of Common Council-man, as unimportant, and below the acceptance of the most intelligent, and respectable amongst you. There must be a consequence attached to the proceedings of men, whose actions regulate the conduct of others. However absurd or contradictory, nay, however mischievous and

2 C

even wicked the resolves of the Common Council may be, those resolves serve as examples to all the corporate Towns in the Kingdom. They become in a great measure epidemic, and the City of London becomes in fact responsible for the guilt and folly of the nation.—Do not therefore suppose, that the odium belongs exclusively to the Common Council; a far greater portion of guilt and folly attaches to ourselves, for having furnished improper and incapable men with the means of dishonouring our character and injuring the Country. Their errors and their crimes are no less ours than theirs. We gave existence to both, by delegating a power to men, who had neither wisdom to exercise, nor virtue to resist the temptation to abuse it.

As a Body whose Councils have evidently an extended and decisive influence, the greatest circumspection should be observed in the choice of materials of which it is composed; and as not only our Rights and Interests are confided to their discretion and ability, but those of our posterity, let me again conjure you not to consider the office as trivial, or of little importance, requiring neither talents, experience, nor honesty. Before you vote ask yourselves this question, Would you if you had an affair of some difficulty to submit to arbitration, confide in the understanding or integrity of the men you are about to vote for? If not, how then, can you possibly reconcile it to your conscience, to deposit into the hands of these individuals a trust of such magnitude.

I beseech you to remember, that not only our civil and political rights are for twelve months surrendered into their hands, but that several local duties are confided to their care: that the licencing of Victuallers, on which the morals of the lower orders of society depend: the paving, lighting, watching and cleansing of the metropolis, so conducive to the preservation of health, to personal security, and comfort, belong to the Common Council. You will also recollect, that they have the management of a revenue amounting to nearly 100,000*l.* per annum, the application of which has been employed, not in improving and embellishing the City, not in removing public nuisances, or in works of public utility, but in public dinners, jobs, and improvident schemes.

If the decisions of the Common Council have for the last 25 years been gene-

rally opposed to our interests, look at the characters, the pursuits, the talents of the individuals who have exultingly promoted such injurious measures, in opposition to better and more temperate judgment; which, happily for the country, now appears likely to obtain that weight it ought at all times to have. The men to whom I allude have, in order to accomplish their own sordid and corrupt views, long arrogated to themselves a consequence to which they have not the least pretension. It is to these presumptuous, and at the same time servile agents, that the authors of our public grievances have enjoyed so long a furlough from national resentment. Let us, then, by a manly exercise of our elective franchise, give an effectual check to the iniquitous career of these presumptuous individuals in the Common Council; which will be a prelude to the disgrace and punishment of their abandoned and profligate employers.

Fellow Citizens: It is neither possible, nor I trust necessary in an Address like the present, to enumerate the long catalogue of evils which the folly and misconduct of our rulers have inflicted upon the country, even during the present year, much less for a long series of years passed. With an expenditure of 80 millions per annum, what have we achieved? Have we lessened the power of the enemy? or have we added to the security of the country? Our taxes, particularly the Income and Assessed Taxes, are demanded of us with increased rigour and severity; our grievances remain unredressed, corruption, abuse and peculation in the public expenditure unreformed; thousands and thousands of our brave soldiers have ingloriously perished in Spain and Walcheren. The land is filled with afflicted parents, widows, and orphans, to mourn their guilty loss, whilst the remains of our gallant army are now languishing with sickness and disease.

While the nation at large, feeling for the wounded honour of the country, have been anxiously looking up to the Corporation of London to take a lead in demanding inquiry, we have seen the sycophants of the Common Council, instead of sharing with the country in the generous indignation which it feels at beholding a vast empire crumbling to pieces, instead of joining with the virtuous part of the corporation to call for reform of abuses, these place-hunting canker-worms, destitute alike of talents, probity, or shame, have endea-

voured to prevent inquiry into these failures and disgraces, by drowning the complaints of the people in the tumult of general feasting and illuminations. Imbecility and crime have found in them protection, and they have constantly opposed every measure calculated to remove the present corrupt system, without which removal this kingdom must ultimately fall, as other kingdoms have done, under the power of a foreign sword.

It is to prevent a calamity of this extent—it is that our rights may be preserved to the very end of time, that I call upon you to select men worthy of your confidence, and with talents suitable to the times in which we live. Remember that the trust we delegate is not exclusively our property: nor is it to be exercised exclusively for our own benefit; but a trust confided in us for the security and advantage of the whole community. This truth cannot be too strongly impressed upon our minds. Our existence as a state may depend upon our integrity and prudence in the exercise of this right. It is a mistaken generosity, and at this period a very hazardous experiment, to allow unworthy or incapable individuals to retain their situations merely because they have held them for years. Nor is it less criminal in those who have talents equal to the discharge of the duties, to withhold their services at a moment like the present, when the nation is tottering under the imbecility of a corrupt and despicable faction, avowedly unequal to what they have undertaken, and who have held out flags of distress for assistance to men as unworthy as themselves. Feel as men ought to feel when assailed with difficulties; Come forward like men; Vindicate your rights; Retrieve your character, by dismissing those who have betrayed their trust, and giving the Corporation the full benefit of your talents and your virtues; Shame the unprincipled hirelings of the day into that obscurity from which their conscience should inform them they ought never to have emerged: Form immediately Committees in your respective Wards for the purpose of bringing forward and supporting proper Candidates.

Nov. 18, 1809.

A CITIZEN OF LONDON
OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

SPECIAL JURIES.

Sir; The appearance of a letter by your correspondent W. F. S., in your Register of the 11th of this month, recalls,

to mind a former one by that gentleman, on the abused organization of Special Juries, which I had intended to notice at the time, with a view to trace the evil to its source, and to shew the true character and extent of it; but which afterwards escaped my recollection, and has not since been thought of. This explanation will, I trust, apologize for advertizing to a paper, inserted so far back, as the 30th of September last.—The question, I conceive, embraces a wider field of argument, and involves considerations of infinitely more importance, than what have been ascribed to it by your correspondent. He has stated a case for the contemplation of your readers; but, by confining himself simply to the recital of that case, without attempting to account for it, or speculating on its consequences, has left the argument incomplete. The facts adduced by him, and the quotations cited from Professor Blackstone, are only useful to establish the truth of his position, that Special Juries are not now organized as the law intended they should be; but, why this difference in their organization has taken place,—whether it tends to the advantage of the community; and, if not, how it may be remedied, he has hardly thought it necessary to explain.—Now, it appears to me, that, before condemning an abuse (by which, in a case of this sort, is to be understood, an aberration from any customary or prescriptive act), it is indispensable to know, if such abuse could have been avoided; and, at least, politic to inquire, if, upon the whole, it is injurious to the parties who may be affected by its operation. Your correspondent has complained, that Special Juries are now composed of tradesmen and manufacturers; that these members of society are dubbed “Esquires,” in the Sheriff’s book; and that though, by this insertion, and a competent qualification in respect to property, they may answer in denomination to the persons mentioned for the execution of the office,—yet, that, by want of education, and a consequent narrowness of mind and principle, they are virtually incapable of acquitting themselves properly; that the men alluded to are not of this description; that they are real esquires; and that a real esquire is a man possessed of understanding as well as property, whose rank, and opulence, and independence, are only subservient to the improvement of his intellect and the developement of his talent.—If I understand your correspondent rightly, this is what he means, Sir; and

certainly it is sound doctrine, unimpeachable philosophy. But, still, I am afraid, this notion of an Esquire, this character of a Special Jury-man, is founded in theory rather than in practice, and accords better with the Utopian system of sir Thomas More, than with instances to be selected from real life.—I will not take upon me to affirm what may have been the state of society at the time the law in question was enacted; nor, indeed, what it may have been in the day of sir William Blackstone, although, if we are to believe that which is recorded of him, he, too, made a difference between writing on the principles of the constitution and illustrating them by his practice; but, this I may state, without fear of contradiction, that those men who are considered now a-days in the light of native 'Squires,—I mean men of independent fortunes, acquired and transmitted to them through the industry of their progenitors; are infinitely less competent to discharge the duties of a Special Jury, than the objects of your correspondent's censure. They formerly may have been distinguished from their fellow countrymen, by qualities more substantial, and attributes more respectable, than empty titles and a relative state of riches; but now, alas! the man of fortune is identified with the man of fashion, and, of all characters upon earth, the man of fashion, considered exclusively as such, is the most despicable and disgusting.—A pedestrian or a pugilist, a jockey or a gamester, now marks him to public notice, and stamps distinction on the rising race of noblemen and young esquires; their leisure and independence are sacrificed to folly; their spirit is debauched by the meanness of their pursuits: the parade and pageantry of a *Whip-Club* exhibit sufficient scope for their emulation, and the attitudes of a bruiser, or, perhaps, the pedigree of a pointer, are among the most abstruse and severest of their studies. And yet, these men complain of a disposition, on the part of the people, to degrade nobility, and to bring the higher orders of society into contempt, as if any thing could more effectually tend to do so, than their own profligate demeanour and ignorance of understanding. Indeed, it is truly lamentable to reflect on the degenerate and disgraceful state of this part of the community, opposed to the situation of their inferiors: whilst the latter are contending against the pressure of the times, and substituting solid study and rational forms

of learning, in place of those amusements with which they were wont to soothe the cares of life and soften the fatigues of business, but which they are now unable to afford; the former is, at best, indulging in inanity, or running through the scenes of fashionable dissipation.—But, the order of employment is inverted: the amusements of the poor are converted into objects of study by the rich; while the studies of the rich are transmuted into means of relaxation by the poor!—What such a man as Locke, who in his work on Education treats the ignorance of men of fortune in matters of jurisprudence, as an actual absurdity, would say to this exchange, one may easily conceive; but, without probing the grievance deeper, it is cutting enough to think, that those designed by the law to discriminate between right and wrong, and to admeasure and assign its penalties, are, for the most part, ignorant of its first principles, and are certainly incompetent to serve on Special Juries, to whom the more refined and intricate parts of it are referred.—I cannot, therefore, agree with your learned correspondent, that the removal of the men objected to by him, from our Special Juries, and consequently the introduction of such as I have described, would be a public benefit, or better answer the purpose of the legislature: for, it is manifest, that our present Jurymen are superior in understanding; and as to sentiment and feeling, in regard to those cases where a sense of honour is required to appreciate a breach of duty, or estimate a loss of happiness; where pecuniary costs and damages are the only reparation that can be made for a violence committed on a man's internal quiet and reputation; it would in regard to these, be little better than a joke, a mere mockery and make-game, with so many great delinquents before our eyes, to select a tribunal from the higher paths of life, or pack a jury from the fashionable sphere. The idea is really laughable; one might as well think of drinking brandy to check a fever, or of using acids to correct a cholic. For my part, if I were in the situation described by your correspondent,—deprived of my wife's affections, and supplanted in her esteem; wounded in my honour, and injured in my fame, by the machinations of an artful scoundrel, calling himself my friend; I would rather submit my claim to a jury of enlightened Tradesmen, with a respectable Undertaker

at their head (since a person of that profession is stated by your correspondent to have acted in such capacity on a late occasion),—men, susceptible of the comforts of domestic life, and patterns in themselves of conjugal fidelity, than even to a set of Peers, with a prince or prelate for their foreman, if the latter were deficient in these respects, and not exempt, by law, from serving upon Juries.—In short, Sir, your correspondent must perceive, that the evil he complains of, arises rather from the general depravity of society, than from any wanton innovation on an established principle; and that it is unavoidable, and even desirable, considering the incapacity of those alluded to by the law.—He has, I am sure, from his style of writing, too much candour to impute to me any interested motive, in commenting on his paper; my only aim in doing so, having been to remove an impression that it may have excited in disparagement of public justice, as administered in our courts of law, which, notwithstanding the abuse in question, the prevalence of party spirit, and the preponderating influence of the executive government of the country, was never, I believe, dispensed with greater purity and freedom than at the present moment.—Before concluding the discussion of this topic, as reference has been made to the admirable treatise of sir William Blackstone, I am tempted to transcribe a passage from it in regard to Juries, which cannot be too seriously attended to by every Englishman who values the privileges of his constitution:—"All gentlemen of fortune are, in consequence of their property, liable to be called upon to establish the rights, to estimate the injuries, to weigh the accusations, and sometimes to dispose of the lives of their fellow-subjects, by serving upon Juries. In this situation, they have frequently a right to decide, and that upon their oaths, questions of nice importance, in the selection of which some legal skill is requisite; especially where the law and the fact, as it often happens, are intimately blended together. And the general incapacity, even of our best Juries, to do this with any tolerable propriety, has greatly debased their authority; and has unavoidably thrown more power into the hands of the Judges, to direct, controul, and even reverse their verdict, than perhaps the Constitution intended." I am, Sir, yours, &c. S. Hendon, Nov. 12, 1809.

MR. WARDLE

AND THE

EDINBURGH REVIEWERS.

SIR; I cannot contemplate the fallacious misrepresentation of these writers, of Mr. Wardle's Speech on the Public Expenditure, at the same time with the extensive influence of their book on the public opinion, without seeking through your aid to do justice to his extraordinary merits. After a preamble full of praise of Mr. Wardle as one of "the most zealous, and able champions for economy and reform," and for having "come fairly forward with the items of his proposed deductions," language truly becoming their subject, and coming from such authority as ought to make the servile authors of the Morning Post blush for their base calumnies, they proceed to lay down this position; that "the main saving, and indeed all that in a national point of view, is worth attending to, is to be effected by a reduction in the number or allowances of our army and navy." Now, Mr. Cobbett, I do not hesitate to assert, that a statement more false, or more demonstrative of a vicious perversion of fact, never was made. The writer of it must have known how gross a falsehood he was attempting to give currency to, and it is but too manifest that his motive could be no other than that of a wish to please a party who have uniformly vilified and opposed Mr. Wardle; because he could not have been unacquainted with those points of Mr. Wardle's Speech which I am about to refer to, and which will shew, that, so far from any reduction being proposed in the effective force of the country, no one saving can be considered as having the smallest tendency to diminish it.—In order to make out his case the Edinburgh Reviewer says, "a certain proportion of infantry and cavalry are to be discharged," but of what kind, any of our regulars, militia or volunteers? not a single corps or regiment, except two regiments of household troops, that are never sent on service, and whose duties could be performed by the heavy dragoon regiments: and except a reduction of the cavalry regiments from 23,409 to 18,000, a reduction which has the sanction of some of the ablest officers, and which, if effected, would leave a force of cavalry, that with the volunteer cavalry would be equal to every duty the state could desire. It is positively false that Mr. Wardle proposed to discharge a single man of the infantry, and in saying that he did, the Reviewers

have in terms said what was not true. Nor did he, as they alledge, propose that the remains of the Volunteers should be discharged. On this head he adopted the opinion of sir R. Wilson that, "military cloathing is not necessary for such a force," and proposed a saving equal to the expence now incurred by cloathing the Volunteers. Of the whole therefore, of the assertion of the Reviewers, as far as relates to a reduction of our army, all of it that is good for any thing, is just so much of it as can be borne out by the disbanding of two regiments of household troops, and reducing our cavalry from 23,000 to 18,000 men. So much for their honesty and accuracy!—They have stated truly, that Mr. Wardle proposed to disband the foreign corps. But not correctly that such a measure would be a reduction of our army; looking to its efficiency, and not to its numbers, for its value, because no man capable of appreciating the character of our constitution, and of what really forms the safety of the empire, can say, that 24,000 foreign troops add any thing to our security; but, on the contrary, his mind must revolt from the idea of such a force having existence in our country, and be forcibly alive to apprehensions of danger rather than to confidence in security, whenever it contemplates so formidable a force wholly unconnected with the interests and liberties of the people.—The Reviewers go on to say, "no more fortifications are to be constructed; the allowances to the militia are to be reduced; a third part of the sum destined for the Navy is to be withdrawn. But, "these were not measures of economy, but measures of state policy."—Not measures of economy? So because by hook or by crook the idea of a measure of state policy can be attached to any proposition by which a saving of millions will be effected to the public, then it is not to be a measure of economy, therefore to have no merit or attention bestowed upon it, but to be wholly disregarded, and the people told to be satisfied, and not to expect its being adopted, because they are quite under a mistake, have nothing to say to it, but must leave it entirely to the ministers, who alone have concern with measures of state policy!—But in regard to these fortifications, how stands the fact; is it at this moment a measure of state policy to vote 700,000*l.* a year to extend them? After some hundred millions of money had been expended upon them in the course of the last twenty years, and after it is quite plain to every man who

ever read a newspaper, that this expenditure was wholly useless, any other person besides the writer of this Review might have been willing to allow that the question was no longer one of state policy; but one more belonging to the head of state corruption, and, therefore, most fit for the budget of Mr. Wardle.—As to the allowances to the militia, Mr. Wardle proposed that they should be allowed to work at harvest for three months in the year, and during these three months to stop their payment, a practice of the famous King of Prussia.—But the most scandalous opinion broached by the Reviewers is, that on the subject of the naval expenditure, they say, "that any retrenchment of the funds appropriated for the navy, must be attended with the utmost hazard."—It really, (Mr. Cobbett), is quite melancholy to think, that a work which has by its former opinions so deservedly gained great weight with the public, should contain so base a prostitution of talents as is here exemplified in this short sentence. What, after the facts which have been heaped upon facts of an unquestionable and unquestioned fixed nature, proving how much of the annual naval expenditure is actually robbed from the public by those who belong to the naval department, is it possible that any man could have been found that would venture to step forward in support of this system of state corruption and common robbery, and give a calm deliberate opinion, such as these Reviewers have here given? I am sure that the public have too much good sense to be led astray on this point, even by the influence of these Edinburgh Reviewers.—But now, Sir, having, I conceive, completely refuted the assertion of the Reviewers, that the main saving proposed by Mr. Wardle was to be effected by a reduction in the Army and Navy; I will shew by a reference to his published Speech what proportion of the saving can have no possible connection with the reduction of either.

	<i>l.</i>
Staff of 15 Militia Corps reduced - - - - -	10,000
Cloathing Local Militia - - -	700,000
Cloathing and Staff of Volunteers - - - - -	1,000,000
Staff of the Army - - - - -	200,000
Recruiting Staff - - - - -	200,000
Army Agency - - - - -	51,075
War Office - - - - -	24,000
Pay Office - - - - -	24,000
Medical Department - - - -	200,000

Commissariat - - - - -	500,000
Barracks - - - - -	350,000
Army Cloathing - - - - -	270,000
Collection of Revenue in Great Britain - - - - -	1,051,930
Collection of Revenue in Ireland - - - - -	388,367
Commissioners and Auditors of Public Accounts - - - -	70,000
Bank; The sum charged for the management of the National Debt - - - - -	210,594
Pensions, and Offices executed by Deputy - - - - -	200,000
Bounties - - - - -	150,000
Colonies - - - - -	500,000
Catholic Emancipation - - -	2,000,000

£. 8,099,841

Here, Sir, is a saving proposed of eight millions, without including a single item exposed to either of the two objections of the Reviewers, either as being a reduction of military defence, or belonging to a question of state policy. Was it, then, fair for them, in giving so decided an opinion upon what they are pleased to call the extraordinary statement of Mr. Wardle, to pass these items over in silence, and thus give their authority to the ingenious but false imputations of Mr. Huskisson, to take from the true value of this truly astonishing display that Mr. Wardle made of the practicable measures which might be adopted to ease the burdens of the people? But the sober judgment of the people of England will not be led astray so easily. The facts which have been disclosed of waste and corruption in the control of the Public Expenditure cannot be so readily effaced. They know too much not to see that Mr. Wardle must be right, and that there is room even for doing much more than he proposed to do. For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that if a very few members of the House of Commons stand by him in his endeavours to obtain a financial reform, he will before the end of next session carry with him the public approbation and support fully as extensively as he did in the business of the Duke of York.—Your obedient servant, VERAX.

SPEECH

Of the REV. MR. SHEPHERD, delivered at the recent Celebration of the AN-

NIVERSARY of MR. ROSCOE'S Election, taken

From the Statesman.

Gentlemen; I have witnessed, with the greatest pleasure, the enthusiasm with which you have paid your tribute of respect to our late worthy representative; and that, not merely on account of the friendly sentiments which I have long entertained towards Mr. Roscoe, but because, in my humble judgment, this enthusiasm augurs well of the final success of the glorious cause in which we are jointly embarked. (Applauses.) To this cause, Gentlemen, the course of passing events, should induce us most steadily to adhere; for the occurrences of every day more manifestly demonstrate its truth and justice. Yes, Gentlemen, I am persuaded we cannot better prove our attachment to the country, than by treading in the steps of our much loved and valued friend, the anniversary of whose election we are now met together to celebrate; and in opposing the proceedings of those weak and wicked ministers, who have too long directed his majesty's councils, and who have obstinately and perversely persevered in a system which has reduced this nation to its present deplorable condition. (Applauses.) I trust, Gentlemen, that we shall never forget the means by which those ministers came into place; I trust also we shall ever remember, that the foundations of their power are bigotry and intolerance; that they were wasted into office by the drunken belchings of "No Popery" and "Church and King." (Loud applauses.)—What are these watch words of party, Gentlemen, but the signals of riot, and the instigators of persecution? What do ministers and their adherents mean, when they stimulate the intoxicated multitude to cry out "No Popery!"? Do they mean to say, that the Roman Catholic Religion shall not be exercised in this country? If so, they fly directly in the face of the law of the land. But do they mean to insinuate, that there is some noxious charm in that religion, which renders its professors hostile or indifferent to their native land? I maintain, that the history of the world, and the course of passing events, give the lie to this insinuation. Who are they, who have in spite of disaster and discomfiture, time after time, rallied round the standard of the Emperor of Austria, to defend his throne and their country? They are Roman Catholics. Who are they, who,

from the bleak summit of the Tyrolean mountains, at this moment breathe defiance against the Conqueror of the Continent? They are Roman Catholics. Of what faith were the heroes who chose to perish amidst the smoking ruins of Saragossa, rather than submit to the oppression of their country? Why, to a man, they were Roman Catholics. (Loud applause.) Referring to these instances, and a thousand others which might be mentioned, I will always maintain, that, as I expressed myself on a former occasion, the flame of Loyalty and Patriotism can glow in the breast of a Roman Catholic. (Applause.) And from the nature of things, Gentlemen, it must be so; for, upon what is the principle of patriotism founded? It is founded upon the possession of property; upon the enjoyment of the protection of the law; but more than that, perhaps it is founded upon the charities of social and domestic life. (Loud applause.) Until then it can be proved to me that the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland have no stake in the country; till it can be proved to me that they are destitute of natural affection, that they feel no love for their parents, no fondness for their wives, no tender solicitude for the welfare of their children, I will maintain that they are fit to be trusted with arms in defence of their country, and woe befall the man who basely insinuates the doctrine that they and their country have different interests. (Loud applause.)—Again, Gentlemen, what mean those words which, in the season of turbulence, we see chalked upon our walls, and hear resounding amidst the conviviality of our opponents? What means the noted symbol of party, Church and King? Gentlemen, I will tell you what it means, and for this purpose I will borrow the language of an eminent Dignitary of the Church of England, whom I have the honour to reckon among my friends; when immediately after that most disgraceful outrage, the Birmingham Riot, this Dignitary was called upon, in the midst of a large company, to drink the toast of Church and King, he addressed the Master of the feast in the following terms, "Sir, I venerate the Church, the holy offices of which I have long been accustomed to administer; I trust also that the whole tenor of my life proves that I honour my King; but I will not drink the toast of Church and King, for I well know what is the meaning of those words when they are put in conjunc-

tion. Their meaning is a Church above the State, and a King above the Law. Against these principles I will protest to the latest moments of my life." So said this Dignitary, Gentlemen, so say I, and so I am confident say we all. (Applause.) Yes, Gentlemen, after the example of this Dignitary, we will honour the King. We will honour him constitutionally. We will also testify our regard to him, but in a mode different from that adopted by Mr. Spencer Perceval and his adherents, should it so happen that a pledge confessedly unconstitutional is required from his Ministers. Should it so happen that an unpopular and insulting answer is given to an address from the metropolis of the kingdom, we will not say, these are the personal acts of the King, and must not be called into question. No, Gentlemen, we will take our stand upon the platform of the Constitution, and our motto shall be, "A King that can do no wrong, but Ministers that are responsible for every act of state." (Loud applause.)—And, Gentlemen, what a weight of responsibility rests upon the shoulders of Mr. Spencer Perceval and his co-adjutors! For what is the substance of the history of Britain for the last eighteen months but a series of disgrace and disasters abroad, and the open and unblushing patronage of corruption at home? (Applause.)—Amongst the foreign transactions of Ministers stands first in order of time the celebrated Convention of Cintra. Permit me, Gentlemen, to go back to that period, I will detain you for as short a time as possible. (Loud cries of hear, hear!)—Such of you, Gentlemen, as I had the honour to address on a similar occasion on this day twelve months, may perhaps recollect that I then expressed my opinion that no satisfactory result was to be expected from the Court of Enquiry, which was appointed to examine into that transaction. Gentlemen, the event justified my prognostic. That Court did not probe the transaction in question to the bottom.—By its very constitution, indeed, it was precluded from so doing; it was a Court of Military Inquiry; and of Military Inquiry only; and I have no doubt that its verdict was strictly correct, which declared that no blame was to be imputed to the Commanders of the Expedition. Still, however, it was the general feeling of the country, that blame was to be imputed somewhere; and I think that this feeling was right, and that I can demon-

strate
rious k
Minist
expedi
surd
minut
howev
comm
which
worth
(Colo
lowing
succes
enem
plann
quaint
the en
vide t
portin
they
of pr
absolu
it hig
the
Gene
plan,
to its
us try
rules
Well
eight
suran
able
ed to
point
Fren
amon
Two
recei
sequ
rein
good
rived
mee
Role
I tru
sion
dier
with
glor
ed
Com
vict
sup
For
to
mer
two
ows
nier

strate to you, that blame of the most serious kind is to be imputed to his Majesty's Ministers, who planned and organized the expedition.—Gentlemen, I am not so absurd as to pretend to be a critic upon the minutiae of military operations. I do, however lay claim to credit for a little common sense, under the guidance of which, and under the correction of my worthy and gallant friend on my left (Colonel Williams), I lay down the following positions, That in order to insure success to an expedition against a foreign enemy, it is absolutely requisite that the planners of that expedition should be acquainted with the number and species of the enemy's forces, that they should provide their troops with the means of transporting artillery and ammunition; that they should secure an adequate supply of provisions; and, though it may not be absolutely necessary, yet I should think it highly expedient that the conduct of the expedition should be entrusted to a General, well apprised of its objects and plan, and who is intended to prosecute it to its termination. Now, Gentlemen, let us try the expedition to Portugal by these rules. On the 12th June, 1808, Sir Arthur Wellesley set sail from Cork, with between eight and nine thousand men, under assurances from Ministers, that the disposable force of the French in Lisbon amounted to no more than four thousand.—In point of fact, Gentlemen, the numbers of French troops in Portugal at that time, amounted to four and twenty thousand! Two days after Sir Arthur sailed, they received more correct information, in consequence of which, they sent after him reinforcements. These having, more by good luck than good management, arrived in time, Sir Arthur was enabled to meet the enemy; he did meet them at Roleia and Vimiera—his soldiers did, what I trust (allow me to correct my expression, what I am confident), British soldiers always will do, when they contend with a foe—they covered themselves with glory. (Loud applause.) They repulsed and defeated the enemy. But their Commander was unable to follow up his victory. And why? On account of the superior number of the enemy's horse. For, be it known to you, Gentlemen, that to a British army of eighteen thousand men, there were attached no more than two hundred and ten cavalry.—At the outset of this expedition, great inconvenience was experienced, from the want

of horses to convey the artillery and ammunition. And for this, Sir Arthur accounted to the Board of Inquiry in a very singular manner. For he stated, that thinking that the horses of the artillery (which we must presume to be sound and good) would suffer from the hardships of the service, he substituted, in their place, a number of Irish cast cavalry horses, worth about twelve or thirteen pounds each. (A laugh). Why, Gentlemen, with the good leave of my worthy friend, Mr. Casey, I must say that this was a most Irish mode of fitting out an expedition, and that Sir Arthur's plan would have been consistent and complete, had he, instead of able bodied men, filled his battalions with tottering invalids and Chelsea pensioners.—(Loud laughing.)—When, Gentlemen, Sir Arthur took his departure from Cork, he was instructed principally to depend upon the country to which he was going for supplies of provisions. When he arrived in Portugal, which supplies itself with bread for only seven months in the year, provisions were so scarce, that he was earnestly solicited to victual the Portuguese troops who joined him, from the stores which he had brought with him in his ships. And as to the permanency of the Commander-in-Chief, it is, I believe, an unparalleled circumstance, that in the course of twenty-four hours the British army was under the orders of three different Generals.—Gentlemen, you well remember the outcry that was raised against Sir Hugh Dalrymple. You remember the Newspaper edged with black; and the protest of various towns against the odium of having given him birth. This outcry was eagerly encouraged by Ministers, as it tended to divert the attention of the country from their own insufficiency. It is highly probable that some of us here present joined in this outcry; if so, let us make Sir Hugh the *amende honorable*; let us acknowledge that no blame is attachable to the Military Commanders of the Portuguese Expedition; let us bestow our execrations where they are due; namely, upon those Ministers who planned that Expedition, and whose ignorance and incapacity rendered necessary a Convention which made Britain the laughing-stock of Europe.—(Applauses.) By this Convention, however, Portugal being cleared of the enemy, Ministers resolved to expel the French from Spain. With this view, they sent into that country an army under the com-

mand of Sir John Moore, who was most pointedly instructed to pay great attention and deference to the communications which he might, from time to time, receive from Mr. Hookham Frere, who was residing in Spain, in quality of Minister Plenipotentiary on the part of his Britannic Majesty. On this second occasion Ministers betrayed their ignorance of the numbers and resources of the enemy. Had they sent double the force which they did send, it would have been hardly sufficient to secure the object of the Expedition. And as to the vigilance and superior intelligence of the highly accredited Mr. Hookham Frere, one fact will settle your opinion upon that point. He was so singularly vigilant that he contrived to apprize Sir John Moore of the capture of Madrid by the French, three days after the news of that event had been published in the London Papers (A laugh). In fact, this vain and foolish man was led by the nose by a couple of traitors, at whose instigation, he in a most offensive and insolent manner pressed Sir John Moore to make a forward movement, which would have infallibly insured the capture of Sir John and his whole army. The sagacity of the British Commander, however, preserved him from the snare. He effected his retreat to Corunna. Under the walls of that town, he fought the enemy—he conquered—and he fell.—He fell bravely fighting at the head of his gallant troops. (Loud Applauses.)—Had I the honour of being of the kindred of Sir John Moore, I should have rejoiced at that event. For truly honourable was his death; and it saved him the extreme severity of mortification. For, to the eternal disgrace of Ministers be it said, that while the generosity of the enemy was gracing the fallen Hero with the honours of the tomb, the malignity of ministerial hirelings was whispering away his fair fame, and attempting to tarnish his reputation. A foresight of this seems to have embittered his last moments. For in his dying agonies he said, “I hope my country will do me justice.” Yes, Gentlemen, his country will do him justice; and whilst she consigns his calumniators to the contempt which they merit, she will inscribe his name in the list of her most illustrious heroes. (Loud Applauses.)—With the same pen too will she record the disgrace of those Ministers, whose incapacity occasioned the sacrifice of him, and of his gallant followers. (Applauses.)—The failure of the first Spanish Expedition was,

however, imputed to the want of zeal, or to the overcaution, of Sir John Moore. To remedy this deficiency, Ministers entrusted a second Expedition to a General, who was stated to be of a different description; who was trumpeted forth as being all spirit, activity, and vigour; and who had reaped a rich harvest of laurels on the plains of Hindostan. You are all aware, Gentlemen, that I allude to Sir Arthur Wellesley, now Lord Wellington. Well, what was the result of all this enterprize and activity? He rashly advanced, without intelligence, and unprovided with magazines of provisions, into the heart of the country. In consequence of the customary negligence of Ministers, when he met the enemy, he found their number double his own. By astonishing efforts of valour, his soldiers earned for him the title of Baron Talavera—in return for which his improvidence left them sick and wounded in the hospitals of that town. Gentlemen, if Lord Wellington be the high-spirited individual which he is represented to be, if he have that nice sense of honour which he is reported to have, this title of Talavera will be a perpetual torment to him. He will regard it as a blot upon his escutcheon—as the record of his disgrace. (Applauses.)—Before I close the melancholy list of our expeditions, permit me briefly to notice the Expedition to the Coast of Holland. While the Emperor of Austria was struggling with Buonaparté, Ministers determined to make what they call a grand diversion. For this purpose they equipped a force of an hundred thousand men.—But, according to inveterate custom, they were too late in their preparations; and when Lord Chatham arrived at the mouth of the Scheldt, he learnt, to his astonishment, that Antwerp was a fortified town: that the approaches to it could be laid under water; and that the Scheldt was bristled with batteries and forts. In short, the upshot of this Grand Expedition was the burning of Flushing, and the capture of the Island of Walcheren, which has proved to be the grave of our gallant countrymen.—But we are seriously told that though the ulterior objects of this expedition are not accomplished, much has been done, since Walcheren is a capital situation for the carrying on a contraband trade. A contraband trade, Gentlemen! An hundred thousand men employed in establishing a contraband trade! Oh, that we should have lived to hear the potent and

pious Sc
sented b
a gang
to see t
who was
from on
other, i
gling be
of Holl
yet I d
Parliam
our cost
and Lo
Spain, v
ties, as
the mos
this from
which w
defence
I on this
the Duk
more, th
prepared
tion in
peared
not only
to retain
Need I
Lord C
of offeri
for a s
Who c
conduct
read wi
not to p
cause th
conclud
doctrine
Lancast
gued, w
transitu
house, (p
poor w
proper t
cause.
rant of t
appeal t
you had
ing the
not have
though
single g
same pr
of corru
no long
the pers
ing th
the Hon
such wa
on a
ic feeli

pious Sovereign of the British Isles represented by his own servants at the head of a gang of smugglers (loud applauses), or to see the Genius of British Commerce, who was wont proudly to spread her wings from one extremity of the ocean to the other, metamorphosed into an eel wriggling her dirty way through the mud banks of Holland. (Loud applauses.)—And yet I doubt not, Gentlemen, that when Parliament assembles, as it will soon do to our cost, this Expedition to Walcheren, and Lord Wellington's Expedition to Spain, will be vindicated by great majorities, as being planned and conducted with the most consummate wisdom. I argue this from a consideration of the last Session, which was occupied by the varnishing and defence of every species of abuse. Need I on this head remind you of the affair of the Duke of York, of which I will say no more, than that a ministerial majority was prepared, in spite of the disgraceful situation in which his Royal Highness appeared to the eyes of the nation at large, not only to encourage, but to solicit him to retain the office of Commander in Chief. Need I to remind you of the conviction of Lord Castlereagh, or his own confession of offering to barter East India Patronage for a seat in the House of Commons? Who can think, with patience, of the conduct of the House on that occasion, or read without indignation, its resolution not to proceed against his Lordship, because the bargain had not been actually concluded? Good God, Gentlemen, what doctrine is this? I once heard at the Lancaster Assizes the question gravely argued, whether a man who was caught *in transitu* in a chimney, had broke into a house, (a laugh) and where the life of a poor wretch was at stake, it was fit and proper to raise an argument upon such a cause. But Lord Castlereagh was a servant of the King and of the Public; and I appeal to you all, Gentlemen, whether, if you had caught one of your servants picking the lock of your iron chest, you would not have dismissed him from your service, though he had not actually carried off a single guinea, or a single note. On the same principle I maintain that such a mass of corruption as Lord Castlereagh, should no longer have been permitted to approach the person of his Majesty, and that it was fitting that he should have been expelled the House of Commons.—Gentlemen, such was the public feeling; but upon this, as on a thousand other occasions, the public feeling was, by the House of Commons,

held in contempt. And how happened this? Gentlemen, I will tell you. Because 151 individuals return a majority of that House. This certainly ought not to be. (Loud applauses.) Till this evil is remedied, we shall see no good times for Old England. (Applauses.) We have lately heard a great deal of the strenuous endeavours of the inhabitants of the Metropolis to put down the Private Boxes of Covent Garden Theatre—would to Heaven that I could see the same spirit rising in the country at large to put down the Private Boxes in St. Stephen's Chapel. (Loud plaudits.) Till placemen, pensioners, and jobbers, are swept from the Benches of the Senate, how can we expect prudence in the granting, or economy in the expenditure of the Public Money.—I have seen a good housewife raise water from a pump that is out of order, on pouring a quantity of water down the pump-stock; this refreshment causes the sucker to play, and produces a copious stream. I leave it to your consideration, Gentlemen, whether some such process does not occasionally produce a copious stream of public money.—It is doubtful, Gentlemen, whether we shall soon be able to do any thing on a large scale respecting Parliamentary Reform. We shall, however, in all probability, soon have an opportunity of doing something in the retail way. It is well known that dissension and mutual recrimination have shaken the foundation of ministerial power. When Parliament meets, things will be found, to adopt General Gascoyne's celebrated expression, "to be at sixes and sevens." (A laugh.) So much so, indeed, that in all probability the gallant General may once more vote according to his conscience. (A laugh.) This phenomenon must forebode some great event, which event I take to be a dissolution of Parliament. (Applauses.) In that case, I trust, Gentlemen, that the Town of Liverpool will second your endeavours, and that in lieu of our present Representatives, we shall return two men, who, without any selfish views of private emolument, will dedicate their talents to the promotion of their Country's good.

AFFIDAVITS,

Read in the Court of King's Bench, in the Case of WRIGHT against Mr. WARDLE.

(From the Statesman.)

Affidavit of Simeon Bull.

SIMEON BULL, of Holles-street, Cavendish-square, in the County of Middlesex,

House-agent, maketh Oath, and saith, that in the month of June, 1808, the Plaintiff, above-named, with whom this Deponent was then unacquainted, applied to this Deponent, to take of him, this Deponent, a ready furnished house in Holles-street aforesaid, for a Mrs. Farquhar, whom he described as a lady coming from the country, by whom he was employed to look out for a house, which he was also employed to furnish for her. And this Deponent further saith, that he accordingly let his said house, and that Mrs. Clarke, assuming the name of Farquhar, came into and occupied it; but this Deponent finding out whom she was, went to the said Francis Wright, and insisted upon Mrs. Clarke leaving the said house at the end of the month, which she did do. And this Deponent further saith, that the said Francis Wright, the Plaintiff, and Captain Thompson, the brother of the said Mrs. Clarke, called upon this Deponent, and paid this Deponent the rent, and that there was a dispute between the said Plaintiff and Captain Thompson, as to the name in which the receipt should be given by this Deponent.

Affidavit of Sarah Mumford.

SARAH MUMFORD, of Holles-street, Cavendish-square, in the County of Middlesex, widow, maketh Oath, and saith, that she resides with Simeon Bull, of Holles-street, aforesaid, and his wife, and assists them in letting the houses belonging to the said Simeon Bull, and keeping of the accounts relative thereto. And this Deponent further saith, that in the month of June, 1808, she recollects the Plaintiff coming in the evening, with Mrs. Clarke, who passed by the name of Farquhar, to look at a house in Holles street, belonging to the said Simeon Bull. And this Deponent further saith, that she went over the said house with the said Plaintiff and Mrs. Clarke, and acquainted them with the terms thereof; and the said Plaintiff then told this Deponent that he had seen Mr. Bull that morning, and learnt the terms of him, and he informed this Deponent that Mrs. Clarke might stay in the house for a month or two, as he was looking out for a house which he was employed to furnish for her.

Affidavit of Joseph Curt.

JOSEPH CURT, of Coventry-street, Haymarket, in the County of Middlesex, Coffee-House keeper, maketh oath and

saith, that in the month of October, 1808, Mrs. Mary-Anne Clarke, now of Westbourne-place, Chelsea, in the said County of Middlesex, but then of Bedford-place, Russell-square, in the same County, called upon this Deponent with one Captain Thompson, whom this Deponent understood to be her brother, for the purpose of taking of this Deponent the house she now occupies in Westbourne-place aforesaid. And this Deponent further saith, that at the time Mrs. Clarke so came to this Deponent, she said her name was Farquhar, and referred this Deponent to the Plaintiff above named for a character. And this Deponent further saith, that he accordingly called upon the said Plaintiff for the character of Mrs. Clarke, whose name this Deponent then understood to be Mrs. Farquhar: that he saw the said Plaintiff, and requested of him, as between one tradesman and another, to be candid; whereupon the said Plaintiff assured this Deponent he would be so; and told this Deponent that Mrs. Farquhar was a most respectable Lady, that he had taken several thousands of pounds of her money, and that if he had fifty houses to let, she should have her choice of them all.—And this Deponent further saith, that he then enquired of the said Plaintiff whether Mrs. Clarke, speaking of her by the name of Farquhar, was married or not, to which the said Plaintiff replied, that he believed she had been married, but whether her husband was living or not he knew not. And this Deponent further saith, that being satisfied with the character he had so received from the said Plaintiff of the said Mrs. Clarke, he, this Deponent, expressed such his satisfaction to the said Plaintiff, and afterwards acquainted Mrs. Clarke, that she should have his said house. And this Deponent further saith, that he soon afterwards went to, and saw the said Mrs. Clarke, in Bedford-place aforesaid, for the purpose of completing the arrangement about the terms of the said house; when this Deponent, in a conversation which then took place, thinking that the furniture which he saw was her own, observed to her, the said Mrs. Clarke, that he thought the furniture in Bedford-place would suit the house she had taken of him, this Deponent; to which the said Mrs. Clarke replied, that the furniture he, this Deponent, spoke of, was too old-fashioned, and that she only intended to take with her a few articles of it, such as beds and drawers, and that the said Plaintiff was

to new furnish for her the house in Westbourne-place. And this Deponent further saith, that some short time before the lease, which was granted by this Deponent to Eliz. Farquhar, the mother of Mrs. Clarke, was executed, and which lease was executed and bears date on the 9th day of November last, he, this Deponent, was returning from the house in Westbourne-place aforesaid, and met the said Plaintiff in the King's Road, going there for the purpose, as the said Plaintiff then informed this Deponent, of taking measure for the carpets and fenders, to be put down in, and sent to the said house. And this Deponent further saith, that it was only just before the said 9th of November that this Deponent saw the mother of the said Mrs. Clarke, and was given to understand that the house was taken for her, and that the person he had before seen was her daughter. But this Deponent did not become acquainted with the real name of Mrs. Clarke, until after the execution of the said lease; and when he did so, and found out whom she was, he, this Deponent, remonstrated with the said Plaintiff for the deception he had practised upon him, which the said Plaintiff did not attempt to deny, but told this Deponent he thought he had known whom Mrs. Clarke was. And this Deponent further saith, that after the house had been so taken as aforesaid, the execution of the lease was delayed for a time, on account of the said Mrs. Clarke wishing not to pay this Deponent for the grates and other fixtures in the said house until the end of twelve months, when she acquainted this Deponent she should purchase of him the original lease of the said house, and for which purpose a clause is inserted in the lease granted by this Deponent. But this Deponent saith, that having himself taken and paid for the said fixtures at a valuation at the time that he bought the original lease of the said house, he, this Deponent, objected to Mrs. Clarke's proposal, and insisted upon having the money; whereupon the said Francis Wright, on the day and at the time of the execution of the said lease (which lease is witnessed by the said Plaintiff, and Wm. Stokes, the Attorney of the said Plaintiff and of Mrs. Clarke), gave this Deponent a draft upon his bankers for one hundred and six pounds fourteen shillings and sixpence, the amount of the valuation of the said grates and fixtures. And this Deponent further saith, that the first

due and not being paid, this Deponent employed Messrs. Robins to distrain for the said rent, and such rent was then paid by a bill or draft of the said Plaintiff, and the second quarter's rent was also paid by a draft of the said Plaintiff on his bankers.

Affidavit of Sir Richard Phillips.

SIR RICHARD PHILLIPS, of Bridge-Street, Blackfriars, in the City of London, Knight, maketh Oath and saith, that on or about the 8th day of March last, this Deponent was applied to by Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke, of Westbourne-place, Chelsea, in the county of Middlesex, to publish her Memoirs, and certain Letters written to her by his Royal Highness the Duke of York, which publication this Deponent declined to engage in. And this Deponent further saith, that in the latter end of the same month of March, this Deponent, under the supposition that he was the proprietor of the said book, was applied to by the Earl of Moira, and at his request commenced a negotiation with Mrs. Clarke for the suppression of the said book about to be published by her as aforesaid. And this Deponent further saith, that in the course of the treaty for the publication of the said book, the said Mary Anne Clarke assigned, as a reason to this Deponent for making the most of the said publication, that she had 2,000*l.* to pay to Francis Wright, the Plaintiff above-named, for the furniture sent in by him to her house in Westbourne-place aforesaid. And when this Deponent afterwards negotiated with the said Mary Anne Clarke for the suppression of the said book, the said Mary Anne Clarke stated, that a sum of money must be given her for the payment of her debts; and amongst the debts enumerated by her, she, the said Mary Anne Clarke, mentioned the debt so due from her to the said Plaintiff as aforesaid.

Affidavit of James Glenie, Esq.

JAMES GLENIE, of Woolwich, in the County of Kent, Esq. maketh Oath and saith, that on or about the 16th day of December last, Mary Anne Clarke, of Westbourne-place, in the County of Middlesex, urged this Deponent, with tears in her eyes, to ask the Defendant, above named, to become answerable himself, or to procure some friend to be so to the Plaintiff above-named for the sum of 500*l.* to be paid in two or three months; and the said Mary Anne Clarke then repre-

presented to this Deponent, that she was distressed by the Plaintiff's pressing solicitations for money. And this Deponent further saith, that he, this Deponent, then informed the said Mary Anne Clarke, that he could not think of asking the said Defendant to comply with such her request, for that he, the Deponent, knew the Defendant's determination not to come under any engagement to pay her debts, either to the Plaintiff or to any other person; but this Deponent observed to the said Mary Anne Clarke, that if she could point out any method of repaying the sum she wanted in three months, in that case he, this Deponent, would speak to the Defendant on the subject, not doubting but that he, the Defendant, would, on such conditions, be disposed to assist her, the said Mary Anne Clarke, in getting some person or other to afford her such temporary accommodation. And this Deponent further saith, that the said Mary Anne Clarke assured this Deponent, she should be able to repay the money in less than three months, out of the sale of a book she was about to publish. And this Deponent further saith, that soon after this conversation had passed between the said Mary Anne Clarke and this Deponent, the said Defendant came, when this Deponent took him into the garden of the house in Westbourne-place, and there mentioned the request the said Mary Anne Clarke had made. But this Deponent saith, that the Defendant refused to comply therewith; and this Deponent further saith, that afterwards, and about the 20th of December, this Deponent, at the request of the Defendant, called upon the Plaintiff to beg that he would not continue just then to press the said Mary Anne Clarke for money, and this Deponent in such conversation then informed the Plaintiff, that it was impossible for the Defendant to pay or engage to pay the debts of the said Mary Anne Clarke, whether due to him, the said Plaintiff, or to any other person; and this Deponent further saith, that the said Plaintiff never pretended to this Deponent, that there was any debt due to him from the said Defendant, or that the said Defendant had, in any manner, become or agreed to become responsible for the furniture supplied by the Plaintiff and sent into the house at Westbourne-place aforesaid; on the contrary thereof, this Deponent says, the said Plaintiff represented to this Deponent, that he had given credit to the said Mary Anne Clarke, for the furni-

ture sent into Westbourne-place, in the hope that she would thereby be induced to repay him, the said Plaintiff, which his Royal Highness the Duke of York had promised, but afterwards refused to pay; and this Deponent further saith, he recollects a conversation afterwards taking place between this Deponent and the said Mary Anne Clarke, in which this Deponent observed, that, in the opinion of this Deponent, it would be more to the credit of the said Mary Anne Clarke if, considering her situation, she had a smaller house, and less expensive furniture. And this Deponent further saith, that the said Mary Anne Clarke appearing displeased at this Deponent's remark, he, this Deponent, informed her, that several of her friends concurred with him, this Deponent, in opinion; and that he, this Deponent, had heard the Defendant make the same remark; to which the said Mary Anne Clarke, as this Deponent well remembers, replied, "What is it to Colonel Wardle what house and furniture I have?—he is not to pay for it." And this Deponent further saith, that he was subpoenaed on the part of the Plaintiff, and attended upon the trial of the said cause, but was not called or examined; and this Deponent says, he well remembers that the said Defendant was anxious that this Deponent should be examined as a witness on his part, and actually sent this Deponent, with Major Dodd, into Court for that purpose.

Affidavit of Richard Stonehewer Illingworth.

RICHARD STONEHEWER ILLINGWORTH, of Pall-Mall, in the County of Middlesex, wine-merchant, maketh oath, and saith, That in or about the latter end of the month of Dec. last, this Deponent was applied to by Major Dodd, who dealt with this Deponent as a wine-merchant, to give his acceptance to the Plaintiff for 500*l.* on account of Mrs. Clarke, and to take her note for the same sum, which Major Dodd assured this Deponent Mrs. Clarke would be able to pay when it became due. And this Deponent further saith, that he was before this time unacquainted with the Defendant, never having seen him but once; and that Major Dodd proposed as a guarantee to this Deponent, to give his acceptance to this Deponent for 250*l.* and the Defendant's acceptance for 250*l.* both which last mentioned acceptances were to become due before the acceptance to be given by this Deponent to the Plaintiff, but after the note to be

given by Mrs. Clarke should fall due : and this Deponent further saith, that having agreed to comply with Major Dodd's request, he, this Deponent, went to Mrs. Clarke, and told her that he came there by the desire of the said Major Dodd, and that if she would give her note for 500*l.* he, this Deponent, would accept the Plaintiff's bill for that sum. And this Deponent further saith, that Mrs. Clarke did give this Deponent her note, dated the 27th of December last for 500*l.* payable three months after the date thereof, but which note was never honoured ; and that he, this Deponent, thereupon accepted the Plaintiff's bill for the said sum of 500*l.* And this Deponent further saith, that at the time of this Deponent's calling upon the Plaintiff to give his acceptance for the 500*l.* he knew nothing of any dealings between the Plaintiff and Defendant, nor had he ever heard of any investigation about to be instituted by the said Defendant in the House of Commons ; nor did the Defendant, or the said Major Dodd, express any wish that their names should be kept secret. And this Deponent further saith, that at the time he called upon the said Plaintiff, no conversation passed between the said Plaintiff and this Deponent, respecting the said Defendant or Major Dodd, nor was either of their names mentioned or referred to in conversation by this Deponent or the said Plaintiff, for this Deponent says he was but a few minutes with the said Plaintiff, and merely mentioned to him that he came to give his acceptance for 500*l.* on account of Mrs. Clarke. And this Deponent further saith, that when he called upon Mrs. Clarke, he acquainted her that he came there at the desire of Major Dodd, and that upon her giving this Deponent her note for 500*l.* he this Deponent would call, as he afterwards did do, and give the Plaintiff his acceptance for 500*l.* And this Deponent further saith, that nothing ever passed between this Deponent and Major Dodd, and Mrs. Clarke, and the Plaintiff, or any or either of them, from whence this Deponent was induced to believe, or given to understand, that the said Defendant had ordered, or was indebted, or in any manner responsible, to the said Plaintiff for the furniture sent in by him to the said house at Westbourne-place. And this Deponent further saith, that he was subpoenaed by the said Plaintiff on the trial of the said cause, but was not called or examined ; but this Deponent well recollects, that the said Defendant

was anxious that this Deponent should be examined on his behalf.

Errata in Mr. Newenham's Letter, in Register of 4th inst.

P. 683, l. 46, *for trial, read trials*

684, l. 58, *for imperative, read inoperative*

685, l. 34, *after or insert emolument*

687, l. 23, *for it is read is it*

688, l. 24, *for upon read under*
25, *for that read the*

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SWEDEN AND RUSSIA.—*Treaty of Peace between Sweden and Russia. Dated 5-17th Sept. 1809.—(Continued from p. 768.)*

V. The sea of Aland, (Alands Haf) the Gulph of Bothnia, and the rivers of Tornea and Muonio, shall hereafter form the frontier between Russia and the kingdom of Sweden.—The nearest islands, at an equal distance from the main land of Aland and Finland, shall belong to Russia, and those which are nearest to the Swedish coast shall belong to Sweden.—The most advanced points of the Russian territory, at the mouth of the river of Tornea, shall be the isle of Bjorken, the port of Rentehamn, and the peninsula on which the town of Tornea stands. The frontier shall then be extended along the river Tornea, to the confluence of the two branches of that river, near Kengis. It shall then follow the course of the river Muonio, passing in the front of Muonioniska, Muonio Ofreby, Palajoeus, Rultane, Enontekis, Kelottijorfoi, Paitiko, Nuimaka, Raunula and Kilpisjaure, to Norway.—In the course of the rivers Tornea and Muonio, such as it has been described, the islands situated to the east of the Thalwag shall belong to Russia, and those to the west of the Thalwag to Sweden.—Immediately after the exchange of the ratifications, engineers shall be appointed on each side, who shall proceed to the before-mentioned places, to fix the limits along the rivers Tornea and Muonio, according to the above described line.

VI. His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias having already given the most manifest proofs of the clemency and justice with which he has resolved to govern the inhabitants of the countries which he has acquired, by generously, and of his own spontaneous act, assuring to them the free exercise of their religion, rights, property, and privileges, his Swedish Majesty

considers himself thereby dispensed from performing the otherwise sacred duty of making reservations in the above respects, in favour of his former subjects.

VII. On the signature of the present Treaty, information thereof shall be transmitted immediately, and with the greatest celerity, to the Generals of the respective armies, and hostilities shall entirely cease on both sides, both by sea and land. Those acts of hostility which may in the mean time be committed, shall be regarded as null, and shall not infringe this treaty. Whatever may be, during the intervening period, taken or conquered, on the one side or the other, shall be faithfully restored.

VIII. Within four weeks after the exchange of the Ratifications of the present Treaty, the troops of his Majesty the Emperor of Russia shall evacuate West Bothnia, and repass the river Tornea.—During the said four weeks, there shall be made no requisition of any kind whatever on the inhabitants; and the Russian army shall draw its supplies and subsistence from its own magazines, established in the towns of West Bothnia.—If during the negotiations, the Imperial troops have penetrated in any other direction into the Kingdom of Sweden, they shall evacuate the countries they have occupied, in virtue of the before stipulated conditions.

IX. All the prisoners of war, made on either side, by sea or land, and, all the hostages delivered during the war, shall be restored in mass, and without ransom, as speedily as possible; but at the latest within three months, reckoning from the exchange of the ratifications; but if any prisoners may be prevented by sickness, or other cause, from returning into their country within the period specified, they shall not thereby be considered as having forfeited the right stipulated above. They shall be obliged to discharge, or to give security for, the debts they may have contracted, during their captivity, with the inhabitants of the country in which they may have been detained.—The expences which may have been incurred by the High Contracting Parties, for all subsistence and maintenance of the prisoners, shall be reciprocally renounced, and provision shall respectively be made for their subsistence, and the expence of their journey to the frontiers of both places, where commissioners from their Sovereigns shall be directed to receive them.—

The Finland soldiers and seamen are, on the part of his Majesty the Emperor of Russia, excepted from this restitution, with reference to the capitulations which have taken place, if they grant them a different right.—The Military and other Officers, natives of Finland, who may wish to remain, shall enjoy that privilege, and the full exercise of all their rights over their property, debts, and effects, which they have now, or may hereafter have, in the kingdom of Sweden, on the footing of the 10th Article of the present Treaty.

X. The Fins now in Sweden, as well as the Swedes now in Finland, shall be at full liberty to return into their respective countries, and to dispose of their property, moveable and immoveable, without paying any duty of removal, or any other impost due on the like occasions.—The subjects of the two High Powers, established in either country, Sweden or Finland, shall have full liberty to establish themselves in the other, during the space of three years, from the date of the exchange of the ratification of the present Treaty; but shall be held to sell or alienate, during the said period, to any subject of the Power whose dominion they desire to quit.—The property of those who, at the expiration of the above term, have not complied with this regulation, shall be sold at a public sale, by authority of the Magistrate, and the produce thereof delivered to the owners.—During the three years above fixed, it shall be allowable to all to make such use as they may please of their property, the peaceable enjoyment of which is formally secured and guaranteed to them.—They may, themselves, or their agents, pass freely from one state to the other, in order to manage their affairs, without experiencing any obstacle whatever, in consequence of their quality of subjects of the other power.

XI. There shall henceforth be a perpetual oblivion of the past, and a general amnesty for the respective subjects, whose opinions, in favour of one or the other of the High Contracting Parties during the present war, may have rendered them suspected or liable to punishment. No trial shall hereafter be instituted against them on such grounds. If any process have been commenced, it shall be annulled and superseded, and no new proceeding shall be commenced. *(To be continued.)*